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## Translator's Note

This translation has been made from the first edition of M. M. Botvinnik's Selected Games (Izbrannie Partii) 1926-1946, published at Leningrad in 1949; like that volume, it includes the World Champion's introductory article on the Russian and Soviet school of chess, his six studies, and his article discussing the meaning of the word "combination," as well as a table of his achievements in the various tournaments and matches he has played from 1923 down to 1948. I have added an alphabetical index of Botvinnik's opponents in these " 100 games," and an index of openings. It will be noted that games 72-78 are also to be found in Botvinnik's Championship Chess, but in these cases the revised text of his " 100 Selected Games" has invariably been followed.
I must again acknowledge my great indebtedness to Miss Eileen Tranmer for her invaluable co-operation in checking moves and suggesting textual improvements.
S. G.

## FOREWORD and THE RUSSIAN AND SOVIET SCHOOL OF CHESS

## Foreword

I learned to play chess at the age of twelve, while attending secondary school. My brain was fresh, it could take in an unlimited amount of the information, the elementary knowledge, which is necessary to the perfection of a player's technique and to a master's creative activity at the board. On this preliminary task I had to spend four years, the period from 1923 to 1927. I won the title of Master in 1927, during the U.S.S.R. Fifth Championship tournament, held in Moscow; and one can say that this completed my first period of "chess development."
If you are going to make your mark among masters, you have to work far harder and more intensively, or, to put it more exactly, the work is far more complex than that needed to gain the title of Master. To begin with, you find yourself up against experienced, technically well-trained tournament players. And then, if your advance is swift, others play against you far more energetically.
And, thirdly, every successive step up the ladder grows more difficult.
At this stage you have to learn how to analyse and comment on games, for that enables you to criticize your own failures and successes. You have to accustom yourself to practical study at home, you have to devote time to studies, to the history of chess, the development of chess theory, of chess culture.
Finally, you have to acquire more experience and, in few words, to grow little older.
All this took me about six years (1927-33). It must not be thought that for those six years I occupied myself solely with chess. During this period I worked my way through the Leningrad Polytechnic Institute. There is no better place for learning to work independently and to extend your horizon than in a higher school (in my view, a higher education cannot but be beneficial to a chess master, even if it is not, strictly speaking, compulsory for him).
During this second period I learned to analyse and annotate games. In addition to regular work for the periodical, Chess Sheet (which later became Chess in the U.S.S.R.) I helped in the publication of several books: The Alekhine-Capablanca Match (1931) and a collection of the games played in the U.S.S.R. Seventh Championship (1932). In 1934 I did the annotations for the games of my match with Flohr (published under the title of FlohrBotvinnik Match).
It was roughly about the years 1930 to 1932 that I began to make a practice of winning against masters.
The next step forward is still more difficult: now you have to defeat players who are outstanding even among masters, in other words, to beat grand masters. Before I could achieve this I had to gather additional experience; beginning with 1933 the international meetings in which the Soviet masters participated were of much help in the accumulation of that experience. I had, too, to perfect my analytical powers; I wrote annotations to ali the games of the return match between Alekhine and Euwe (1938), I issued a collection
of my own games (Selected Games, 1937) and a collection of the games of the U.S.S.R. Eleventh Championship (U.S.S.R. Eleventh Championship, 1939). I had to study tournament tactics in detail and to perfect my methods of preparation for tournaments.

How do I prepare?
That has never been any secret. As soon as I had mastered the technique of preparation I expounded my method in the book Flohr-Botvinnik Match. In addition I have read a special lecture on my methods to Leningrad firstcategory players, and in 1939 I published the fundamentals of those methods in the book U.S.S.R. Eleventh Championship.
Above all else, before playing in competitions a player must have regard to his health, for if he is suffering from ill-health he cannot hope for success. In this connection the best of all tonics is 15 to 20 days in the fresh air, in the country.
I begin my actual preparations with a review of chess literature, especially in order to acquaint myself with new and interesting games; as I read I make notes on questions which are of particular interest to me. I also study all the games played by my rivals in the forthcoming competition. I study their peculiarities of play, and their favourite opening variations; this should be especially useful when preparing for each game during the tournament.
Then I study those opening lines which I intend to apply during the contest. Here I must remark that in my view a player should not, and indeed cannot attempt to play all the openings known to theory. For one competition three or four opening systems for White and the same for Black are quite sufficient. But these systems must be prepared thoroughly. If you do not have such systems at your command you can hardly count on finishing very high in the table.
But it is also very unsatisfactory for a master to play only one opening; his opponents will be well prepared for play against him, and above all his chess horizon will be too narrow, in many positions he will simply play by rote.
So now your schemes are worked out; but even that is not enough. Certain of them-those of which you are not absolutely sure-should be tried out in training games. Of course, these games must be played with a partner who will keep them secret, otherwise all your opponents will be as well acquainted with them as you are, and all your opening preparation wili be wasted.
These preparatory games must be resorted to not only in order to try out your opening schemes, but also to give you training in other respects. In particular, for a long time now I have told certain of our masters who regularly get involved in serious time-trouble how to overcome this weakness. Unfortunately, only a few masters have taken my advice, apparently, yet it is very simple. Training games must be played in which the first consideration is the clock, and not the quality of the play, or its result, and this play by the clock must be continued until making the best possible use of the time, including consideration of all the main variations, becomes a habit. I think this method would completely cure 90 per cent of those who suffer from "time-trouble sickness," and the exceptions would of course be incurable!

The same method can be used to eliminate other weaknesses; one particular weakness must be concentrated on in special training games until it is overcome. After a course of such games the master will be able to decide
on his opening repertoire for the forthcoming contest, and he will have tried it out already in practice. All that remains to do now is to prepare for each tournament game separately.
If you are weak in the endgame, you must spend more time on analysing studies; in your training games you must aim at transposing to endgames, which will help you to acquire the requisite experience. Similar methods will make good your deficiencies in middle-game play, though here the problem is more complicated.

Finally, five days or so before the contest all chess activities must be stopped completely. You must take a rest; otherwise you may lose zest for the battle.
I must mention one other possibility of achieving perfection which I myself have always tried to carry out.
What is the essence of a chess master's art? Fundamentally it consists of the ability to analyse chess positions. True, at the board you must be able to analyse very quickly and without touching the men; but in the last resort, whether you are working out the possible variations or estimating the actual position, chess is the art of analysis.
Home analysis has specific features of its own: you are not restricted by time, and you can move the men freely. Despite this difference between home analysis and practical play, there is much in common between them. It is a well known fact that almost all the outstanding chess-players have been first-class analysts.
The deduction is irresistible: anyone who wishes to become an outstanding chess-player must aim at perfection in the realm of analysis.
There is one other essential difference between analysis and practical play; during play your analytical work is continually being tested against your critically-minded opponents, but in home analysis it is very easy to be unobjective. To fight this tendency and to get away from poor analysis it is useful to publish your individual analytical work. Then you are subject to objective criticism. In other words, published analysis, or, quite simply, annotation of games for the press, is a sure method of arriving at perfection.
Of course, notes to games written "during progress," within an hour or two of play, cannot be regarded as analysis at all. Such "analysis" is purely negative, and it may easily become a bad habit.
That is all the advice I can give the player, but it is advice that I myself continually try to follow. Possibly some of my suggestions will not be of much benefit to some players; each must consider them critically and apply them with caution, taking his own individual capacities and habits into account.

This present collection contains one hundred games which I have played at various times during the period 1926 to 1946. The table of my participation in tournaments and matches (p. 269) shows that I have played altogether 578 games, not including those played in team matches; altogether I have now played over 600 games in competitions. So this book gives about a sixth of all the games I have played in my career. The games are arranged in consecutive years, and each "year" is preceded by a brief note of my chess activities in that year.

The book also contains all my six studies, and two articles, one on "The Russian and Soviet School of Chess," the other "What is a 'Combination' ?"

## THE RUSSIAN AND SOVIET SCHOOL OF CHESS

The school of chess which is peculiar to the Soviet Union is deserving of thorough and serious study. Only after many articles have been written, lectures given, and discussions held shall we be in a position to formulate a scientific definition of the creative features of that school. At present we can go so far as to say that such a school does exist, and that during the past fifteen years it has defeated the foreign school.
Chess forms a small yet significant part of our culture, for to-day the people generally are taking a tremendous interest in the game. So we may well be proud that our socialist culture has conquered on this small sector.
What are the inherent qualities of our native school; what differentiates it in principle from the foreign school? In my opinion, it is the social status of the game in our country.
In the old days the general attitude to chess was that it was a "pastime," a "table-game." Even then there must have been many who recognized that chess, with its many centuries' history and culture, was rather more than a mere "table-game," but the general attitude was "amateurish" (in the worst sense of the word). Emanuel Lasker, for instance, gave up playing chess simply because he thought it more profitable to engage in business transactions. For the sake of such transactions he, the world. champion, gave up chess! That may seem difficult to understand, but it is a fact. Lasker treated chess as a craft, not because he had no respect for the game, but because he was conscious of the patronizing, philanthropic attitude to chess which existed in his bourgeois milieu, and he succumbed to that attitude.
Take another outstanding player, Capablanca. In the conditions of the world he lived in he was reluctant to reveal his love of chess, he always emphasized that his main occupation was diplomacy or commerce, that he hardly ever occupied himself with chess, and only "played" when he sat down at the board.
If there was anyone among western players who took a different attitude to chess and devoted all his powers to it, it was probably Paul Morphy (1837-1884), if we are to accept his contemporaries' testimony. But we must not forget that Morphy played in competitions only during a short period of two years.
In Russia the first player to devote all his life to the game, the man who initiated the habit of adopting a profound approach to chess, was Mikhail Ivanovich Tchigorin, and we can only speak of the existence of a Russian chess school from his time onward. A. D. Petroff (1799-1867) was a strong player, but compared with Tchigorin he did not do much to create a Russian school of chess.
Tchigorin approached chess in the same manner as our modern Soviet players. He served the art disinterestedly and self-sacrificially. He had brilliant gifts and enjoyed exceptional popularity, and so in the difficult
circumstances of life in Tsarist Russia he managed to persuade the Russian players of his time and after to take an advanced view of chess.

However, it would not be strictly true to say that the Soviet masters have done no more than adopt Tchigorin's attitude to the game. Their attitude is strengthened by recognition of the fact that chess is a valuable social activity. When Tchigorin was alive only individual amateurs were attracted to it. The Chess-Sheet which he published had to go out of existence simply because in all Russia it was impossible to collect the 250 subscribers necessary to ensure that it should not be published at a loss.
In the Soviet Union thousands of people play chess, and the large printing of our chess periodical is sold out quickly. But even more important is that when we Soviet masters take part in tournaments and study the game we know we are performing a socially valuable, a cultural activity, that we are bringing benefit to the Soviet State. And when we take part in international contests we defend the honour of our country. So there is, of course, a difference of principle between our attitude to chess and that of Tchigorin's time.

The second great Russian master, A. Alekhine, was a disciple of Tchigorin in his supreme fidelity to chess, and so, too, were Nimzovitch and Rubinstein, who both grew up in Russia. True, in Nimzovitch there was also some straining after "originality," after "tricks" but he had Tchigorin's attitude to chess. Rubinstein also had certain characteristics of his own, for instance, his exceptional sangfroid, one might almost say fatalism, his submission to "chess fate." This, of course, had nothing in common with the active, optimistic attitude to chess displayed by the Soviet masters, and which was shared by Tchigorin and Alekhine to a large extent.
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Mikhail Ivanovich Tchigorin (1850-1908) was unusually gifted. We must not forget that he did not learn to play chess until he was sixteen, and that for seven years after he did not play at all. In the short period from 1873 onward he covered a remarkable creative road; he first became the finest player in Russia, and then one of the strongest players, if not the second best in the world.
Tchigorin came from the people. His grandfather was a soldier, and his father a skilled workman in the Okhtensk gunpowder works. He was orphaned when still a lad, and studied at the Gatchinsk orphans' institute, afterwards being compelled to work as a petty official in Petersburg.
He grew up in difficult conditions. He played his first game in 1873, in the Petersburg Café Dominic, a chess rendezvous. Here, playing sometimes for stakes, he took his first steps. (Certain foreign chess-players still experience this unenviable lot!)
In those days there were many professional chess-players abroad, but Tchigorin was the first Russian to decide to devote all his life to chess. He did so in order to bring fame to Russian chess, to make it a national game, to persuade his contemporaries to regard it differently and to treat it as it deserved.
At the very beginning of his career Tchigorin broke with old ideas and set out to realize very great aims, aims that Soviet players especially should value. They were, to ensure the world primacy of Russian chess, and to
make it a national game; and, though he did not fully achieve either, he did a very great deal in both directions.

In order to make progress in the game, and in order to bring fame on Russian chess, he had to travel abroad and take part in international tournaments. He achieved outstanding successes. Among those successes must be reckoned his two matches with Steinitz; though he lost them both, it was not because he was lacking in talent, but because he did not possess the requisite sporting qualities, the qualities of a chess fighter. At the decisive moments of the struggle he lost the will to win, and so he went down. Yet his style of play, and the creative elements he brought to the games were so remarkable that one must consider these two matches as among the treasures of chess art.

Next one must mention his duel with Tarrasch in 1892. This match ended in a draw, but Tchigorin's achievement must be measured by the fact that at this date Tarrasch had won seven firsts in seven international tournaments. In the Hastings tournament of 1895 Tchigorin achieved a remarkable success: he took second place, being surpassed only by the young player Pillsbury, and surpassing all the other outstanding masters of the time.

Russian players always hoped that he would become the world champion. Even after he lost his two matches to Steinitz they did not lose faith in him. But when, some months later, a four-round match-tournament took place in Petersburg, Tchigorin suffered several serious defeats in the first half, and it was obvious that he could never become world champion. He was greatly disappointed.

Tchigorin played a foremost part in developing the chess movement in Russia. To him chiefly belongs the honour of organizing the first All-Russian tournament. He was always agitating for the organization of tournaments and the opening of chess clubs; he wrote a great deal on the subject, he travelled all over the country to help in the organization of clubs; and in the difficult conditions of Tsarist Russia that was an ungrateful task. Before a club could be opened great obstacles raised by the police had to be overcome, for the government was highly suspicious of all clubs of a cultural and educational nature.
The first All-Russian chess tournament took place in Russia in 1899, and of course Tchigorin was the winner. He also won the second and third AllRussian tournaments; but by then he was coming up against stronger opposition-the players of the next generation, his pupils, were coming along.

What was Tchigorin's specific contribution to theory, to chess technique?
He took his work on the Chess Sheet with exceptional seriousness. He published many articles and theoretical analyses; he closely followed the work of Steinitz, subjected it to a thorough check, not infrequently found mistakes, and criticized those mistakes in the pages of his periodical. He was the first chess-player in Russia to occupy himself with analytical work. Yanisch had done so before him, but his analyses were concerned only with the opening game, and not with the game as a whole.
Tchigorin was a considerable innovator in the opening game; he discovered much that was new in the Evans Gambit, the Italian Game, and the Two Knights' Defence; against the French Defence he produced his own continuation (2 Q-K2) after which one gets not the usual French Defence, but rather the King's Indian Defence with colours reversed. It was Tchigorin
who first began to play the King's Indian Defence and worked out an opening scheme for it; he brought many new ideas into the King's Gambit and Ruy Lopez.

To get any idea of Tchigorin's creative style we must realize that he frequently looked not for the rules but the exceptions. When analysing he usually tried to refute the established lines, and to introduce something of his own-an exceptionally valuable quality. Criticism of oneself and others is absolutely necessary in chess, for only the player who is critical of himself and his potential opponents can hope to achieve deep analysis and success. However, in Tchigorin this habit sometimes carried him into extremes. Thorough criticism is essential when preparing for tournaments or making analyses, but objective conclusions are vital when sitting at the board in the tournament hall.

Tchigorin's great weakness was that he did not always take his opponents' psychology into account, he was not sufficiently interested in the psychological factor in chess contests. When pursuing the strategic plans he had thought out he often went straight ahead quite unconscious of his opponent's mood, taking no account of possible danger. This explains why at decisive moments he sometimes had creative disasters, such as we have referred to in his matches against Steinitz.

Sometimes, too, Tchigorin was subjective in his attitude to analytical work. Not infrequently he did not so much attempt to establish the truth and to convey that truth to his readers as to win a battle of polemics against his opponents.

If we study his favourite openings we find that his choice is to be explained partly by his style, and partly by a spirit of contradiction, by an endeavour at all costs to violate the established canons. For instance, it had always been considered that in the Queen's Gambit the Black Knight is well posted at B3 when P-B4 has already been played. But Tchigorin revolted against such a dogma, and his defence in the Queen's Gambit violates this "rule."

This continual endeavour to introduce something new into chess and not simply to apply the well-known dogmas, this creative search for the new, the original, is characteristic of Tchigorin. It is a very difficult task, and he did not succeed, in the Queen's Gambit for instance, in completely solving the problems he himself had raised. The idea of the Tchigorin Defence in the Queen's Gambit is essentially that Black should fight with his pieces. This problem was tackled more successfully later by Nimzovitch, Réti, Ragozin, Grünfeld, and other masters.

Tchigorin's creative work in the middle and endgames was of no less importance.

When I first saw the following position (it occurs in a game between Tchigorin and Tarrasch played at Budapest in 1896) it made a tremendous impression on me. In this Rook endgame the two opponents are equal in material; on the K side White has three pawns against two, but on the Q side Black has a passed pawn. However, Black's defence is complicated by the circumstance that his King is cut off on the first rank. Looking at the position, one would find it difficult to maintain that White could get the win, but Tchigorin set out to prove that he could. We must take into account the circumstance that he had soundly estimated the latent possibilities of this position even during the middlegame, and had deliberately played for this ending.

TARRASCH


TCHIGORIN
He won the game by a subtle manœuvre. Not only that, but in the final stage, when the Rook ending had left each opponent with a passed pawn, he succeeded in setting up a further interesting situation, demonstrating the strength of his passed pawn. Whenever I play a Rook ending I always remember this ending of Tchigorin's, and I would not like to find myself in the tragic situation of Tarrasch. It is highly discomfiting to lose the game when you have an equal number of pawns with your opponent, as discomfiting as it is to fail to win when playing White in a similar position.
Tchigorin was a great master of attack. He possessed superiative combinational sense, and exceptional intuition in sharp, complex positions. When he made a sacrifice he chose that variation not only because he had estimated the position exactly, but also, guided by chess intuition.
In his later years, when he was seriously ill, naturally enough he was not very successful in tournament play. But if he happened to be playing in a thematic gambit tournament, in which gambit openings are obligatory, and everything is decided by sacrifice, by attack, by counter-attack, he remained invincible to the end.
Here is a position which will be familiar to everyone. (We cannot illustrate the characteristic features and peculiarities of our native school better than by quoting well-known examples.)


TCHIGORIN
Position after Black's 18th move

In this position, taken from the first game of a Steinitz-Tchigorin match, the striking $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ! sacrificed a piece; but after $19 \ldots \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $20 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 21 \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{K} 5$ ! the Black King found itself in the middle of the board. By sacrificing a Knight without compensation and forcing the Black King to move into the centre Tchigorin laid it bare to attack. Since then it has been proved that Tchigorin's combination was thoroughly sound. Of course, strictly speaking this is not to be called a combination, as the sacrifice is not based on exact calculation, but arises from an appreciation of general principles. But undoubtedly it was a beautiful sacrifice; and you will find many such in Tchigorin.
Later, Lasker proved that this position could lead to a win by a different, quieter road; but the imaginative method Tchigorin chose was characteristic of him. It was a style which won him great popularity among chess players all over the world.
The next position is of great interest; it witnesses to Tchigorin's outstanding ability in counter-attack. It is interesting, too, because of the fact that no one had previously obtained such a position for Black from the Queen's Gambit. If we did not know that the position arose in one of Tchigorin's games we might well conclude that Black had been played by some modern master, by Ragozin, say; and I certainly would not mind playing Black in such a position. It arose in a game between Tchigorin and Teichman at Cambridge-Springs, in 1904.


TEICHMAN
Position after White's 14th move
With the move 15 ... P-Kt4! Black had his central Knight entrenched at Q4. It is to be noted that some twenty-five years later Grand Master Nimzovitch also entrenched his Knight in the centre in analogous positions (with the aid of the two pawns at QKt4 and KB4). The position appears to be double-edged, as after $16 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ there is a threat of $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, opening the Kt file and launching an attack on the Black King. The basic weakness of White's position is the "strong" posting of his Bishop at K5, even though it is evident that White pinned all his hopes to it! For at K5 the Bishop is badly placed, as it cannot share in the defence of its King when Black begins an energetic counter-attack. Only four moves were necessary:

16 ... Q-K2; 17 QR-B1, Q-R6 ch; 18 K-Q2, P-Kt5!; 19 P-QB4, B-R5; and Black's attack was now irresistible.
I like this position even better than the previous one. It is a position of our own day. Although chess technique has made great strides, modern masters would not be ashamed to play such a game; on the contrary, they would be proud. Yet Tchigorin played it forty-five years ago!

Thus, summing up our analysis of Tchigorin's creative powers, we can say that he was one of the greatest of Russian players, an artist of chess thought, and perhaps the first player in the world to treat the game as it deserves. He did a great deal for the development of chess in Russia and had a very powerful influence on world chess thought.

He was many years in advance of his time, and his work will always be an inexhaustible source for the development and perfection of chess ideas.

## 3

After Tchigorin the next greatest Russian chess player was Alexander Alekhine (1892-1946). His play exhibited a harmonious combination of talent, character, physical powers, and preparation. I think it is these qualities that determine a chess player's success. I must add that by physical powers I mean first and foremost the strength of the nervous system, as, of course, during a tournament it is the player's brain that functions.
As a chess master Alekhine had great strength of character. True, he had his weaknesses and vagaries, but he knew how to fight and overcome them. For instance, prior to his match with Capablanca in 1927 he was a heavy smoker. We all know what it means for a smoker to give up smoking; none the less, in order to feel physically fitter, to improve his form, Alekhine gave it up. And in that match with Capablanca he played perhaps better than ever before.

Grand Master Flohr knew Alekhine well, and he has told that during the years roughly 1930 to 1934, no matter where Alekhine was, in a café, at a concert, or even in a hotel hall, he always and everywhere took out his pocket set and analysed, searched, searched for something new.
He became world champion, and was a professional in the high, creative sense of the word; in his lifetime he probably played as many games as Lasker and Capablanca put together! ${ }^{1}$
He had a very rare and clear combinative vision, and his creative work developed the Tchigorin ideas still further. I know of no other player who had such insight into combinational play. But what exactly is the essence of a chess combination?
I published my views on the meaning of "combination" as long ago as 1939, in the periodical Chess in the U.S.S.R. (Shakhmat v. S.S.S.R.) ${ }^{2}$. And as ten years have passed without anyone making any convincing objections to those views, I may assume that my definition of the term "combination" has been accepted.
From his very first steps in the game the chess player learns to think in terms of the normal relative values of the various chessmen. He is told, and discovers, that a Rook is stronger than a Knight, a Bishop is approximately
${ }^{1}$ Lasker, 504 games; Capablanca, 578; Alekhine, 1076, Vide N. Statesman Nov. 4 1950; p. 410. S.G.
${ }_{2}$ What is a 'Combination'? p. 266.
equal to three pawns, while a Bishop and two pawns are approximately equal to a Rook, a Queen is stronger than a Rook, and so on. However, positions arise in which these relative values no longer apply; times when, for instance, a Queen is weaker than a pawn.

The player's greatest art consists in exploring the possibilities of bringing the game to a position in which the normal relative values cease to operate.

One cannot arrive at such a critical position by way of simple, superficial moves. The road lies through sacrifice, and, on the other hand, the return to normal relations also lies through sacrifice. Frequently both roads, outward and return, are united in a single move, and then we have a one-move combination.

Alekhine had an extraordinary, penetrating insight into sacrifices which lead forcedly to such situations, to positions in which the normal relations no longer apply; and he saw them instantaneously.

Here, for instance, is a position from a game he played against Nimzovitch, in 1912.


NIMZOVITCH
Position after White's 20th move
In this position Alekhine moved $20 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, laying a well-concealed trap for his opponent. The move seems to hold out no threat at all. For instance, after $21 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, Black cannot play $22 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KıP}$, for White replies $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$, and appears to have won the Rook. But in reality $22 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ is a sacrifice which leads to a position in which the ordinary relative values cease to apply. If White plays $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$, then $23 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ ! (a further sacrifice!); $24 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, and mate.
Thus the second sacrifice led to a mate, in other words, back to the "ordinary conceptions" of the chessboard. Unfortunately, this fine variation did not actually come to pass in the game.
Three phases can be noted in the development of Alekhine's creative powers.

The first phase was marked by the acquisition of experience and the development of his combinative vision. The combination involving a Rook and Queen sacrifice, which we have just considered, is characteristic of this phase.

With his gifts and strength of character he swiftly won notable successes,
and soon became the third best player in the world. Now he had to achieve the final step. But in his path to the title of world champion stood two inteliigent, experienced and talented players: Lasker and Capablanca. As a fighter, as a player, Lasker had the more subtle, intelligent, crafty style; but Capablanca had the greater talent.
Alekhine set himself the task of surpassing both these great chess players. And he succeeded. In 1921 Capablanca defeated Lasker, so now Alekhine had to defeat Capablanca. If he was to excel the Cuban player he must assimilate all the new elements that Lasker and Capablanca had introduced into chess technique. Lasker had brought the art of playing in simple positions to great perfection. Capablanca was fond of playing more complicated games, he was a master of the middle-game; but in the later period of his career he, too, was attracted by simple positions.
If Alekhine had not succeeded in assimilating their art and technique, especially in simple positions, he could not have beaten Capablanca.

Here is a position from the 34th and last game of their match.


Alekhine had an extra pawn, but the extremely limited material made a win by no means easy. However, he was able to pull off this very difficult endgame. Even earlier in the game, when White was still without the extra pawn, a slip by Capablanca (later pointed out only by Lasker) enabled Alekhine to exploit subtly a slight positional superiority, and so to transpose to this endgame and victory.
This was essentially the second phase of Alekhine's development; it consisted in mastering a classic style, and the art of playing in simple positions. His defeat of Capablanca to win the world championship in 1927 was a perfectly logical outcome.

During these same years he also mastered the technique of preparing for contests. I make no bones of the fact that when my turn came to prepare for the world championship contest my first step was to make close and detailed acquaintance with Alekhine's introductory article to his collection of games of the New York 1927 Match-Tournament. In this article he related how he had prepared for the match against Capablanca, subjected Capablanca's creative art to thorough analysis, and revealed his own thoughts, his own plans.

At the board Alekhine was so direct that, as he thought out some combination, he was unable to restrain his feelings. When the position was complex, after making his move he would get up and start circling round and round the table like a kite. During the Nottingham Tournament of 1936 I myself had to endure some difficult moments in a game against Alekhine. This game reveals how thoroughly he prepared for playing in tournaments. ${ }^{1}$

BOTVINNIK

alekhine

## Position after Black's 12th move

It was general knowledge that I had played this variation of the Sicilian Defence against Levenfish three months before the Nottingham tournament, and it was regarded as being favourable to Black. So at first I could not understand why Alekhine was playing this opening. But when the position as shown arose I guessed from his expression that he had something up his sleeve, was preparing some combination. And i was right. He had prepared the manœuvre: $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ !.

Not every master would spot this move, for the pawn sacrifice is completely unexpected; its idea is to weaken Black's KB3 square. I managed to "wriggle out" of this unpleasant position, though not without suffering some nasty moments. At the critical point, in my search for escape I had to spend some 20 minutes in thought, and all that time Alekhine circled round and round our table. Summoning all my will power, I managed to free myself of this strong "psychological" pressure and find a way out of the trap.

During his first and second periods Alekhine always sought for the truth in the game; but in his last period (1934-46) his play was characterized by a new, and one might say a Lasker-manner of approach to chess. During these years he did not so much attempt to penetrate into the secret of a position as to seek a convenient moment when, without blundering, he could shatter his opponent with the combinative weapon, even in positions where the prerequisites were lacking. The fourteenth game of his match against Euwe, in 1937, is characteristic in this respect.

Absorbed in the attack, Alekhine played 17 Q-Kt5. Now he risked losing the Bishop at R6, as its retreat was cut off. The game went: $17 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$; 18 QR-Kt1, Kt-B4. By this move Euwe was hoping to avoid complications. but he hoped in vain. If he had played $18 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ he would have had
${ }^{1}$ See Game No. 53, p. 140, infra.
the better game. (I have given this variation in detail in my book Return Match Alekhine-Euwe.)

So Alekhine's tactic against the Dutch grand master was justified, and he seized the initiative. But in the very same game, five or six moves later, he unjustifiably played for further complications, and he should have lost. Evidently Alekhine knew his opponent: Euwe was again entangled in the complications that arose, and suffered defeat.

Of course, such an approach to the art of chess cannot satisfy Soviet masters.

EUWE

alekhine
Position after Black's 16th move
Alekhine also achieved outstanding success as a writer on the game, as an analyst, and commentator. His most important works have all been published in the U.S.S.R.: his collections of the International tournament games at New York in 1927, and his "best games," gathered into two volumes. These are first-rate, fundamental works which everyone seriously interested in the art of chess must study closely.
Summing up Alekhine's characteristic features as a chess player, one must specify first and foremost his exceptional fighting qualities, his profound psychological insight into the essence of the chess art, and his phenomenal combinative vision, which was a reflection of the specific features of the Soviet school of chess.

At the same time I must again emphasize that during the last period of his career his imaginative powers declined.

## 4

We turn to the Soviet period of chess development.
Young Soviet players have always had a broad road open to them in their advance towards perfection. Chess clubs, chess circles in schools, factories and works, in collective farms, government and public institutions, have always opened unlimited opportunities for creative development. If a young player looks at all promising special care and attention is given to him. For instance, in Leningrad the twelve-year old first category player, Boris Spassky, has proved outstanding. And this young player is surrounded with
all the care of the community and has every opportunity of studying at school while developing his talent for chess. This is a feature exclusive to our socialist country.

I think what is at the bottom of it all is not only the favourable conditions in which our chess talents develop. It also derives from that special attention to the game which is a characteristic of Soviet players. We highly appreciate the opportunities afforded us by our State, our government, our Bolshevik party. We recognize our responsibilities, and so never before has chess been studied so seriously, or played so energetically as our Soviet masters now play and study. For us it is a creative life in itself. And so we achieve good results.
The representatives of the older generation of Soviet masters, players like Romanovsky, Levenfish, Ilyin-Zhenevsky, Nenarokov, Rabinovich, and Grigoriev, have played a great part in passing on the experience of the Tchigorin school to our young masters. Troitsky and Kubbel also did much to form our artistic tastes.
What creative features have Soviet players inherited from such outstanding masters as Tchigorin and Alekhine? To avoid being misunderstood I must add that we have of course studied the creative art of such masters as Nimzovitch and Rubinstein, Lasker and Capablanca, to mention only a few; but the two men who have had the greatest influence on the development of the Soviet school are Tchigorin and Alekhine.
From Tchigorin we took over a number of opening ideas, and in our own day the Soviet players are popularizing these openings all over the chess world.

From Tchigorin also we inherited a fine technique; in this respect we still learn and shall go on learning from him. And we have inherited his passion for the initiative. All sorts of people play chess, some more actively, others more passively; but for some reason you never find any completely "passive" players among Soviet masters. In the main we aim at the initiative, at attack, and, in our defence, at counter-attack.

In an article by Grand Master Levenfish, devoted to an appreciation of my creative play, he adduced the fact that I avoid quiet positions as a defect of my game. Well, I have to admit that I do avoid such positions. Moreover, I think this is perfectly logical, and inherent in the style of Soviet players, just as it was in Tchigorin's and Alekhine's style. Naturally, on occasions when passive defence is the only right way, Soviet players do not avoid such systems. But in our preparation for the game, in setting ourselves definite creative objectives, in our creation of works of art at the board, we think first and foremost of the initiative, the attack, the counter-attack, and not of passive defence.
From Alekhine our modern players have inherited his fighting qualities. I doubt whether any other master could boast of such a large number of games won at the decisive moment as Alekhine. From him we can learn the psychological approach to the game and, possibly, creative self-criticism too, though in this respect Soviet masters have left him behind. And finally, and chiefly, we try to develop his combinative vision. To achieve this we resort to a number of methods all of which have as basis the striving for perfection in analysis and the acquisition of extensive experience of struggle in sharp, complicated positions.
Among the active qualities possessed by Soviet masters I must include the
working out of methods of preparation. As I have already remarked, Lasker and Alekhine both had their own methods of preparation, but they were never made public. In the Soviet Union the system of preparation which has been worked out is public property, and I think it can be said that the majority of Soviet masters adopt it when preparing for contests.
The basis of the system is opening preparation, sporting training, the intelligent elimination of creative weaknesses; we must also include questions connected with the atmosphere and conduct of the tournament.

What are the principles of our scheol? First and foremost I must mention our scientific approach to chess. This implies a realistic attitude to the game and a critical attitude to one's own creative work. This has been exalted into a principle. And so Soviet masters are continually seeking something new, continually exploring new roads in the realm of chess theory and practice. For instance, certain masters of the past days played the same openings year after year; but we approach the problem differently. When we study some opening system, when we evolve a "new production technique," we make use of the system only so long as it brings advantage, and then we scrap it and renew the search for a fresh "weapon.'
As a classic example of this creative approach to chess play we can instance the system worked out by Grand Master Boleslavsky in the open variation of the Ruy Lopez associated with $9 \ldots$ B-QB4. When I brought out this ancient move from the archives in 1941 Boleslavsky studied it and went on to prove that in this variation the well-known Queen sacrifice was advantageous to White, and not to Black, as many foreign authorities had considered. In 1942, playing this variation, he won a game against Ragozin in the Moscow Championship. ${ }^{1}$
The systems worked out by Soviet masters are so deep, and they depart so far from the established canons, that at first sight it might seem that they can be refuted easily enough. And so we are able to go on playing such systems again and again, for they prove to have more life than was conceded them.
In fact, though I had spent a fortnight in study of Boleslavsky's variation I all but lost to him at Sverdlovsk in 1943, when I risked playing this variation for Black.
Another characteristic of Soviet masters is their swift publication of a successful experiment. Grand Master Smyslov's victory over Reshevsky in the first game of the Wireless Match between U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. in 1945 was partly due to the circumstance that the American grand master was not acquainted with the analysis work of Soviet masters. It is interesting to note that Smyslov spent less than six minutes on the first 25 moves of the game, whereas by then Reshevsky was already in serious time trouble. It is true that after further research, checked in a number of games played by correspondence, it transpired that after all Boleslavsky's system was not so dangerous for Black. But now he has proposed a new move: $17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$, confronting Black with new tasks.
In no other chess school has the opening technique been so finely perfected as among Soviet players. In 1935 I succeeded in winning a game against
${ }^{1}$ For more detailed consideration of the Boleslavsky innovation, see Championship Chess (MacGibbon \& Kee Ltd., London, Bell Publishing Co., U.S.A. 1950), p. 10. S.G.

Grand Master Spielman in eleven moves, though he had "specially prepared" a variation of the Caro-Kann Defence for this meeting with me. ${ }^{1}$
One thoroughly prepared system determining not only the development of the opening but also the nature of the middle-game is the one I used against Capablanca during the Avro-Amsterdam tournament of 1938. ${ }^{2}$


BOTVINNIK
Position after White's 26th move
White dominates the centre and the K side. Black has superiority on the Q side, but his Knight at QKt6 is cut off from the main "theatre of war." In this game, after $26 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2} ; 28 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$; 29 Q-K5, White had an invincible attack.

It has to be added that the position which arose in the middle-game was not fortuitous; it was the logical consequence of a well thought out opening system.

In the following years this system was adopted in games between Reshevsky and Fine (1941), Botvinnik and Alexander (1946), Euwe and Denker (1946), Tolush and Keres (1946), Reshevsky and Steiner (1946), and others. Even so, the system still needs to be studied and further tested in practice.

Now I must refer to one very successful example of opening preparation. In Moscow in 1940 Mikenas, playing White, defeated me in a sharp variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defence. Theoretical studies were started at once, and the Moscow master Simagin found an almost sound method of play for Black. I too found a sound method, and it seems that Keres also gave much study to the variation. Here was "collective" creative work, though, obviously, not in perfect accord, as each of us prepared his analysis in secret from the others.
The following position arose in a game I played against Keres at Leningrad in $1941 ;{ }^{3}$ the play went: $10 \ldots \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (opening the B file for a frontal attack on the White King); $11 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QR} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ (outflanking the White King; now White has no satisfactory defence). Thus it needed only three or four moves to clear up the position, yet before this game "theoreticians" had regarded the given variation as being in White's favour!
${ }^{1}$ Game 41, p. 116, infra.
Game 59, p. 154

There are positions in which it is more difficult to find the first move than in other instances to calculate a forced variation for ten to fifteen moves ahead. The application of such an opening system as that in my game against Keres can lead to excellent results.


KERES

## Position after White's 10th move

Unfortunately, in this case the continuation has been applied in only the one game; it was so convincing that no one since has dared to play this variation, though perhaps that attitude is not altogether justified.

The next example we shall consider is characteristic. One must assume that it is along this line that Soviet masters will develop their creative play. It must be clearly understood that Soviet players do not seek simple systems in the opening, but try to formulate opening systems in which everything is complicated, distinctive, or new. That, of course, is not by any means the same as purposeless striving for originality.


DENKER
Position after White's 13th move
What will help the player to orientate in the conditions of the complicated middle-game which arises as the result of the modern opening systems?

To begin with, thorough preparation (in which training games play by no means the least part); secondly, a positional sense. However, by this I do not mean the "classic" positional sense which was based on understanding of "general" principles, but a sense based on the sound estimate of actual positions, functioning in the process of intelligent preparation.

The foregoing position, taken from my game against Denker in the U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. Radio Match, $1945,{ }^{1}$ seems quite fantastic; almost all Black's K-side is destroyed, he has no pawn centre, he is a pawn down, and his King arouses serious anxiety.

Yet in reality the Black King finds a secure haven on the Q side, while White's central pawn at Q4 is a convenient object to attack and, with the continuation $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ at the right moment, Black opens the diagonals for his Bishops, after which it is the White King's position that is hopeless. White's material superiority is not of great importance, for the endgame is still a long way off. When this position arose in the game many masters considered Black's situation very difficult; yet within five moves it was obvious that White's position was hopeless, though superfically it seemed that Denker had not made one mistake.
bronstein


ZITA
Position after White's 17th move
Above is another position of some interest; it arose out of a King's Indian Defence opening. I recall that Tchigorin was the first to play this opening, but it is the Soviet players who have succeeded in raising this defence to the level of a real opening system, in the modern conception of the word. Our masters have done a great deal of theoretical work on the King's Indian Defence, and of recent years many games have been played with this opening.

In the game from which this position is taken (Zita-Bronstein, MoscowPrague, 1946), Black's initiative soon grew threatening. Here, too, Black has no pawn centre, but this is completely offset by the happy interaction of the Black pieces. The stroke $17 \ldots \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ !; $18 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$, followed by $18 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ! (White cannot play either $19 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, or $19 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, Kt-Q6!) swiftly brought White to disaster
${ }^{1}$ Game No. 93, p. 238, infra.

It is interesting to note that Bronstein also won against L. Pachmann with a similar combination, in the same match (Moscow-Prague, 1946).

Finally, here is a position of which Tchigorin might have dreamed. It is taken from an Euwe-Smyslov game, played at Moscow in 1948.


EUWE
Position after Black's 8th move
Black's last move was $8 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}$ Q2; in other words, without completing the mobilization of his forces Black begins certain "queer" manœuvres with a piece already developed. Note that White has an "ideal" pawn centre, and he can bring all his pieces into play quite easily; not only that, but Black will have to part with his Queen's Bishop and yield the two-Bishop advantage to White. And yet Black's position is extremely viable, and he is ready for active operations directed against White's pawn centre.

Why was it that in this case the established positional canons proved unrealistic? The whole point was that White had to devote time to occupying his centre with pawns; this circumstance, and also the White Queen's advanced position, enabled Black to gain the decisive tempo for developing a counter-initiative!

Many masters have been critical of this system, but practice is the criterion of the truth. Grand Master Smyslov has played many games with the variation, and I think the system has become part of chess practice for many years to come. It forced us to resurvey and re-estimate the conceptions which seemed to have been established concerning the principles of positional struggle.

5
The contest between Soviet chess and foreign chess has been a historic rivalry. As late as 1933 Grand Master Flohr, who in those days represented Czechoslovakia and was the closest challenger for the world championship title, arrived in the Soviet Union rather as an examiner, to check up on the powers of Soviet players. At that time the West had such outstanding masters as Lasker, Capablanca, Alekhine, Rubinstein, and Nimzovitch, and there was a rather sceptical attitude abroad to Soviet masters. Yet it was in 1933 that the young Soviet chess school passed its first international examination.

Never have we had suciz a number of grand masters and talented youngsters in the Soviet Union as there are to-day. In former days Soviet masters learned from the outstanding foreign grand masters (learning is always a necessary process, and we shall not hesitate to learn from foreign masters in the future also, if their creative work provides anything worthy of study). But now the situation is reversed; foreign masters dream of coming to Moscow in order to meet Soviet players; they subject our chess publications, the games of Soviet tournaments, and our opening systems to close study. When Soviet masters travel abroad they discover that their creative work is thoroughly studied there and is quite well known.
And so in a short period of fifteen years Soviet chess players have changed from "pupils" into teachers. But we must not be satisfied with what we have achieved, we must not get conceited. We must devote all our powers to the development of a mass chess art, to increasing the network of clubs as swiftly as possible, to the publication of new chess books and strengthening the Soviet chess organizations generally.

We must go on developing chess throughout the length and breadth of our land, with the object of making many more workers both in town and country acquainted with the game. And our finest masters must play even better and create further artistic values.

ONE HUNDRED GAMES

## NINETEEN TWENTY-SIX

At the beginning of 1926 I was not exactly a novitiate in the chess world; on the other hand, my two years' tournament experience could not be called extensive.

I managed to achieve reasonably good results in the semi-finals of the Leningrad City Championship, in which players of the first category took part.

To reach the championship final one had to take "absolute" first place in the qualifying tournament. In this tournament I drew one game and steadily won the others, and so for some time I occupied second place, as my rival, a first category player, had won all his games. My deciding game with him lasted some thirteen hours, and ended in his defeat. So I managed to get into the Leningrad Championship.

In the championship itself, "through the inertia" of others, I began well and won the first five games. But, after losing to Master I. Rabinovich, I shared second and third places with him. The Master A. Ilyin-Zhenevsky was first, half a point ahead of us.

In the autumn of 1926 a scratch team from the Leningrad Trade Unions went to Sweden to play a match with a scratch team from Stockholm. In this Leningrad-Stockholm match I had the opportunity of meeting G. Stoltz, to-day an experienced international master. At that time Stoltz was only one of many talented young chess-players, but even so the Swedes were surprised when my first game with him ended in a draw, while in the second I defeated him (see game No. 1).

The result of the match was $12 \frac{1}{2}$ to $11 \frac{1}{2}$ in Leningrad's favour.
In this same year, 1926, I began to collaborate in the paper Chess News (Shakhmatny Listok). I was invited by one of the paper's organizers, Weinstein, to annotate several games.

## LENINGRAD-STOCKHOLM MATCH

November

No. 1. Queen's Gambit Declined

| M. Botvinnik (White) | G. Stoltz (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | B-K2 |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 6 Kt -B3 | P-QKt3 |

Capablanca frequently resorted to this defence (with the preliminary
$P$, so isolating the Q-pawn. The course chosen by Stoltz seems more natural.

White made his next move without stopping to think. Now perhaps I would prefer $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, avoiding simplification and causing Black difficulties with the threat of $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B} ; 13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.
$10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$
$11 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

A combinative miscalculation. True, Black already has a good game, as $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ cannot be prevented, e.g. $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4 ; 13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{BP} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt} ; 14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, Q-Kt4; 16 P-KKt3, Q-Kt5; 17 K-R1, R-B3; 18 R-Kt1, R-R3; 19 Q-KB1, R-R6.

```
12 ...
P}\times\textrm{Kt
\(13 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}\)
B-B1
```

When I decided on the combination I thought Black would continue $13 \ldots$, B-Q4; or $13 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$. In both cases White wins with $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$. I overlooked the simple but strong move Stoltz made.

## 14 B-Kt5

I thought this the best chance; but in reality the correct move is 14 B-K2!, Q-Q3; 15 Q-B1, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 16 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3 ; 17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 18 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, winning a third pawn for the Knight.

$$
14 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}
$$

Black throws away all his advantage. He should have played $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; winning the exchange.
$15 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$
An attractive move, but after it Black has a lost game. $15 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$, would have been better, though even so, after 16 Q-B6, R-Q1; $17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$,

White has three pawns for the piece and exerts strong pressure.

Position after Black's 15 th move


16 Q-QB6!
Q-Kt5
Black finds an ingenious defence. If $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, and White recaptures, keeping two extra pawns.
$17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$
The whole point! If $18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; and $19 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{B}$. However, Black is not destined to realize his intentions.
$18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ! ch
$19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{Q}$

Black is helpless, condemned to passive defence.

| 20 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 21 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 22 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |
| P-Q5 | Kt-K3 |
|  | P-R5 |
| Kt-Q1 |  |

If $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}$, and $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.

| $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | Q-B3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 25 P-KR3 | P-QKt4 |
| 26 P-K4 | K-R2 |
| $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | Q-QKt3 |
| $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | P-Kt5 |
| $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $30 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

$31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
And a few moves later Black resigned.

## NINETEEN TWENTY-SEVEN

I studied hard all the winter, as I was due to finish school in the spring. A scratch team from Moscow arrived in Leningrad for the May-day celebrations. In the Leningrad-Moscow match I had to play against N. Grigoriev, an experienced chess-player who had taken part in U.S.S.R. championships. I succeeded in winning the first game (see Game No. 2) and put up a stubborn defence to draw the second.

A month or so later I left school, and applied for permission to sit in a competitive examination for entry to a higher school, but was not successful. I was not yet 16, and one had to be "turned 17. ." I had to reconcile myself to the idea of losing a whole school year, but on the other hand, to having more time for chess! In the summer I took part in the Leningrad tournament of Six, against very strong competition. I.was defeated by the Master P. Romanovsky, and took second place to his first.

The first big tournament in which I took part was the U.S.S.R. Championship played off in Moscow in 1927.

I took part in this championship rather by accident, as I was only one of the candidates for participation; but I was fortunate, as some of those chosen to play in the actual championship declined to take part.

My game with V. Ragozin (No. 3) may give the reader some idea of how far I was really prepared for participation in the U.S.S.R. Championship.

Twenty-one players took part. It was a very hard tournament for me, with my little experience. I lost four games, but even so I surpassed the standard demanded of a master by $2 \frac{1}{2}$ points, sharing fifth and sixth place.

On 20th October, 1927, I won my game with Y. Rochlin, which brought me one point above the master standard. So a group of Leningrad players (among them, if I remember aright, being A. Model, A. Perfiliev, and V. Alatortsev), took me into the next hall (the tournament was being held in the House of the Trade Unions) and celebrated the occasion by throwing me up to the ceiling. That was the traditional ceremony of "initiation" as a master.

The three games I played against I. Rabinovich, V. Nenarokov, and A. Ilyin-Zhenevsky (Nos. $4,5,6$ ) in this championship were probably my best in the tournament.

# LENINGRAD-MOSCOW MATCH <br> May 

| No. 2. Queen's Indian Defence | $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| M. Botvinnik | N. Grigoriev | $7 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| (White) | (Black) | $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 | This variation is often met with in |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 | tournaments. In those days I always |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-QKt3 | played $3 \mathrm{Kt-KB3}$ and studied the |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} 3$ | B-Kt2 | continuations arising from this move |
| 5 B-Kt2 | B-Kt5 ch | in all their finesses. |

If White plays at once $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ follows, and Black has obstructed the White KP. But after 9 Q-B2; $9 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is followed by 10 Q-Kt3 and $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$.

| 9 | $\ldots$ | QKt-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 Kt-B3 | Q-K2 |  |
| 11 P-K4 | P-K4 |  |
| 12 QR-Q1 | P-Kt3 |  |

Black protects B4 from occupation by the Knight, and prepares the later advance of his BP.

## 13 KR-K1 P-B3

Necessary. True, it greatly reduces the Bishop's scope, but it completely eliminates the constant threat of Kt-Q5.

| 14 | P-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Q-Q2 |
| 16 | B-R3 |
| 17 | Q-R6 |

Attracted by a little trap: $17 \ldots$... Q-Kt2; $18 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ ch, $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 19$ $B \times K t, R \times B ; 20 P \times P$, winning a pawn, White is not up to the mark. The right plan is $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, followed by P-B4, and White would have real advantage.

| $17 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

Black should have continued: $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$, forcing $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$. For then $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is followed not by $19 \ldots$, Kt-Q5 ( $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ !) but by $19 \ldots$ Kt-Kt4! hemming in the White Queen.

## 19 P-Q5

Not $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ !; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$,
P-Q4.
$19 \ldots \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP} \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
The only way! If $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$, and White has a won position.
$21 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{KB} 1$

22 R-Q2
P-B4
A mistake leading to defeat. After $22 \ldots$, P-R4! and $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B4 Black would equalize the game without difficulty.
$23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
24 Q-R5

Position after White's 24th move

$24 \ldots$
P-B5
Loses the exchange, but in any case Black was lost, as the pawn on B4 is indefensible. $24 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B3 would be followed by $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ch, R-Kt2; $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, winning the pawn; $24 \ldots$, Q-K1 by $25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! $(25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}), \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ and wins.

| $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |

If $27 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3) \times \mathrm{P} ; 28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{R} \times$ B ( $28 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} ; \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}) ; 29$ $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QP}$, and Black loses.
$28 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}!\quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$
If $28 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $29 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, Kt-Kt1; 30 Q-B7, Kt-B3; and 31 R-Q1.

| $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}$ |

32 P-B8(Q) Resigns

## TOURNAMENT OF SIX, LENINGRAD <br> July

No. 3. French Defence

| $\quad$M. Botvinnik | V. Ragozin <br> (White) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | (Black) |

As is well known, here 4 ..., $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ ! is stronger, and gives Black an almost equal game. But in those days this was not yet known, and chess players were influenced by the Lasker-Maroczy game (New York, 1924) in which, after $4 \ldots$. P-QB4 White obtained the better game.

| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |

6..., $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP} ; 7 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is no better because of V. Rauzer's move $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, with White having an excellent game. But now, since the Reshevsky-Botvinnik game (Moscow, 1946), White plays Kt-KB3 and Black P-B3, which is undoubtedly in White's favour.

| $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt5}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| $9 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

At once clears up the position. $9 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch is followed by $10 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$; $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, with Black in a difficult position. So Ragozin preferred to withdraw his Bishop.
$\stackrel{9}{ } 10$ P-B3
B-B2
$0 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
$10 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is bad because of $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3(\ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 12 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4)$; $12 \quad \mathrm{~B}-$ $\mathrm{KB} 4!$; $10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is no better; 11 B-R3! with the threat of 12 Kt -Q6 ch.

| $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

13 O-O B-Q2
Not $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ !, P-K5 (15 ..., $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ ! etc.); $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, to White's obvious advantage. Now Black stubbornly attempts to advance the KP, but this only hastens his defeat. 13 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} 1$ was worth considering.

| 14 B-R6 | R-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 Q-Q2 | P-K4 |
| $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

$16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Another possibility is $16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. But White chooses the sharper continuation, leading more quickly to the win.

| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 19 Q-Kt5 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| 20 Q-R5! | B-K3 |

It may seem that Black, threatening $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and $21 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, has achieved a good position.
21 QR-K1 P-K5
Position after Black's 21sí move


Forced, for $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is no good: 22 B-B4! Black has realized one of his threats, but after

## 22 P-QB4!

White's superiority is obvious. Black's centre is crumbling, and White's Bishop begins to operate with great force along the open black diagonals.

There was a lesser evil for Black in
$22 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; but even so he could not save the game.
22 ..
R-B4
23 Q-K2 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$
Not $23 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \mathrm{ch}$.
24 B-B1!
The most decisive. However, 24
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ was adequate; $24 \ldots \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$;
$25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ ! ( $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 26
Q $\times$ R, B-Kt5; 27 Q-R4, Kt-Kt3),
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} ; 26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, etc.
But now $24 \ldots$, R-R4 would be
followed by $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 26$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{QP}!, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 28 Q-K5 ch.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ Desperation! |  |
| $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ |
| $29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ |  |

The simplest way of winning.

| $29 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 Q $\times$ Pch | K-B1 |
| 31 Q-Kt7 ch | K-K1 |
| 32 R-K1 ch | K-Q1 |
| 33 Q-K7 ch | K-QB1 |
| 34 R-B1 ch | Resigns |

## U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP <br> October

No. 4. Dutch Defence

| I. Rabinovich (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-Q4 | P-K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-KB4 |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | B-K2 |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | P-B3 |

The result is the variation known as the "stonewall," in which Black has a difficult game, but White also has difficulty in exploiting his spatial advantage.

Perhaps Black's task is more complicated if White develops his KKt to R3.

## 8 Q-B2 <br> Q-K1

9 B-B4
Not till ten years after this game did V. Chekhover find an apparently better plan for White. In the Chek-
hover-Riumin game (Young Masters' tournament, 1936), White played 9 B-Kt5!, Q-R4; $10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$. By exchanging at Bó White averted any attempt on Black's part to attack on the $K$ side, and prepared his own Q side pawn advance.

| $9 \ldots$ | Q-R4 |
| ---: | :--- |
| 10 QR-Q1 | QKt-Q2 |
| 11 P-Kt3 |  |

11 P-Kt3
Black could not advantageously capture the BP because of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$. Now White decides to defend this pawn in order to free his Knight, but later he suffers for this weakening of QB3.
11 ...
Kt-K5
$12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !
This move was not playable before, because of $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ followed by Kt-Kt5. Now White makes a double threat: $13 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}$ followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ followed
by $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, in both cases with considerable advantage.
Black could win a pawn with the continuation: $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3)$; $13 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$; but after $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, White has the advantage.

## 12 ... <br> Kt-Kt4 <br> Probably $12 \ldots$, B-B3 is better,

 but in compensation for his restricted position Black wants to keep the two Bishops or force a weakening of White's K side. However, now White could reply simply with 13 P-B3, and after $13 \ldots$..., Kt-R6 ch could continue $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 15 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ with an excellent game.13 P-KR4
Kt-K5
14 B-KB3

Irresolute. With $14 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ White would get a better game, as the sacrifice of the exchange $15 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ gave Black no prospects.

| $14 \ldots$ | Q-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K}) \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5!}$ |
| $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |

A serious error. Of course he should have played $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktl}$ with the possibility of defence.

| $17 \ldots$ | BP $\times$ B |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 R-KR1 | Q-R4 |
| 19 P-B3 | Q-Kt3 |

An error. The correct move is 19 ..., P-K4!; $20 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$, with the same position as in the game. But now White could hinder the development of Black's attack.

## $20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ <br> P-K4!

Winning the pawn after $20 \ldots$, $\mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 21 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ would hardly lead to Black's advantage.
At this point with 21 P-R5 White
could save himself from the worst fate, though after $21 \ldots$, Q-B4; $22 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$; Black should have won the endgame. But White chooses a continuation which enables Black to end the game with a dash.

```
21 QP}\times\textrm{P}\quad\textrm{R}\times\textrm{B}
22 P}\timesR\quad\mathrm{ Q-Kt6!!
```

Position after Black's 22nd move

$23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$
There is no better move, as Black is threatening not only $23 \ldots$, B-QB4, but also $23 \ldots$, P-K6. $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ is followed by $\ldots, \mathrm{B}-$ QB4; $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; and $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt8}$, mate.
23 ...

$$
\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}
$$

This is more exact than $23 \ldots$, B-R6 ch as then White could still resist. Now $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ is not possible because of $24 \ldots$, B-QB4; 25 P-K3, B-B4!
$24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$
It was still possible for Black to lose: $24 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6 ; 25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch!!
$25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3 \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch

| 26 Q-B2 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |



Better, of course, than 13 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! (but not $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, because of $15 \ldots$, Q-R4). Now Black forcedly loses the exchange for two pawns, but has two Bishops and good winning chances.

| $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

He could not save the exchange, as $15 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ is met by $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

| 16 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| 18 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |

Destroys the fruits of all the preceding play. The correct move is $18 \ldots$, B-Q2! after which White could at best count on no more than a draw. But now the back rank is undefended, and White launches a direct attack on the King.
19 QR-Q1
B-K4
20 R-Q8 ch
K-Kt2
$21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
But not P-KR3; $21 \ldots$, Q-R5.
$21 \ldots$ B-Q2!
The best chance. White threatened 22 Q-Kt4 with mating attack. But now, if $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, 22 \ldots$, B-B3! and wins easily. However, a little surprise follows for Black.
$22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}!\quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$
$23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$

Position after White's 23rd move


Forced, for if $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, then simply $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB1} ; 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$, and White has an extra pawn. With the text move Black condemns himself to a difficult defence, which none the less leads to salvation.

| $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ |
| $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QKt} 1$ |
| $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |  |

No. 6. French Defence
A. Ilyin-Zhenevsky M. Botvinnik
(White)
(Black)

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Kt-QB3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} 3$ |  |

This system was suggested by Tartakower. In this game Black achieved at least equal play.

| $3 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 B-Kt2 | B-Q2 |

Probably the best. 4 ..., P-KB4 is dangerous, as after $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! at the cost of a pawn White holds the initiative for a long time.

White could play simply: $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{ch} ; 7 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$

There was nothing in $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, K-Kt1; 30 Q-K6, Q-B1!
$29 \ldots$ B-B3
Not, of course, $29 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$. $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 8, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$; $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, K-Kt2 ( $31 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$; $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, B-Kt2; 33 Q-B7 ch, K-R1; 34 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, etc.); $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ ! and White has a decisive advantage.

| 30 | P-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 | P-KR4 |$\quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$

Now, if opportunity offers, Black threatens a very unpleasant check at QR1, and the Queen gets her freedom.
$32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$
P-KR3
33 Kt -B4
The last attempt.

| $33 \ldots$ | Q-Kt2! |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34 Q-K8 ch | K-R2 |
| 35 Q-K4 | B-K4! |

The only, but quite adequate move. If $36 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, then $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, and Black is saved.
$36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { B-Q3 } \\
& \text { Drawn. }
\end{aligned}
$$

with an equal game. $5 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ at once is bad; $5 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ with the unpleasant threat of P-B4. The move chosen by White is not wholly good, as at R3 the Knight is out of play.
$5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$
B-B3
$6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ !

If $6 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, and the badly placed Knight comes into play.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
7 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
8 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3 &
\end{array}
$$

Black was not afraid of $8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ and $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, as he considered that the doubled QB pawns were fully offset by White's weakness on the white squares on his K side and by the ineffective development of the Knight at R3. Later White took
this course, but derived no benefit from it.

| 8 | B-K2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

Black has completed development, and turns to the attack. As he would reply to $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ with $\ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ and $12 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, White is forced into the following exchanges.

| $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

Black plans QR-K1, B-Q3 and P-KB4. But he does not hurry with B-Q3, wishing to mask his scheme a little.

16 B-K3 QR-K1
17 P-QR3
Not, of course, $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 \ldots$, P-QB4.
$17 \ldots \quad$ P-QR3
18 K-Kt2!
Unable to prevent Black carrying out his plan, White sets up a strong defensive position, which proves to be anything but simple to break through.

| $18 \ldots$ | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 P-KB3 | P-KB4 |
| 20 B-Kt1 | R-B3 |

But not $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$, as the R at K 1 is needed to defend the KP.
$21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$
$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ was better; the Queen is
badly placed on the K file. badly placed on the K file.

| 21 K-R1 | P-KR4! |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | P-R5 |

$23 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
P-R5
The only move! It would be suicide to let Black take at $\mathrm{Kt3}$, it would completely break up the King's position.

Now Black should have continued simply R-R3 and collected the RP. Instead he plays weakly, and his advantage begins to fade out.

| $23 \ldots$ | Kt-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 Q-Q2 | R-R3 |
| 25 | B-K3! |

Exactly! Now White will succeed in exchanging off Black's excellent Knight and will have an opportunity to improve his position considerably.

| 25 | $\ldots$ | $R \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | $B \times K t$ | $R \times B$ |
| 27 | QR-K1 | Q-B2 |
| 28 | Q-Kt2 | Q-R4 |

29 R-K3
Weak! The correct move is 29 Q-Kt3!; and if $29 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$, then $30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, equalizing the game.

| $29 \ldots$ | R-K3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | R-KKt1 | Q-R3 |
| 31 | P-Kt4 | R-R5 |

32 Q-K2
An irrecoverable mistake! 32 R K2 was obligatory, to meet the threat R-Kt3.

Note that now Black cannot play $32 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5.33 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}$; $34 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ! and White wins.
32 ...
Q-B5
33 Q-Kt2

Now the White Queen is lost. But even with $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} 2$ things are bad for him, as there follows $33 \ldots$, $R-R 6$ and then $R(K 3)-R 3$, with slow strangulation.

| $33 \ldots$ | R-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34 Q-B2 | P-K5! |

The decisive move! Not so good is $34 \ldots, \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch at once; $35 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3 ; 36 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $37 \mathrm{~K}-$ Kt2. White's next move is forced, as $35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ is followed by at least 35 $\ldots, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ and $36 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$. Defeat also follows $35 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; 36
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 37 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$; and $38 \ldots$, B-B5.

Position after Black's 34th move


| $35 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $36 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |

We still had a long time to play after this. I had the impression that in the text continuation the White King must remain on R1! Victory would have followed quickly after $37 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $39 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{R})-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$, Q-R4 ch; $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ !

| $38 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{K} 2)-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $39 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

In the variation above indicated it would now be Black's move, not White's.

| 41 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 43 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| 44 | K-Q2 | Q-Q5 ch |
| 45 | K-K2 | K-B2 |
| 46 | R-Kt6! |  |

To prevent the Black Queen reaching her KR3, for then the win would be quite simple.
46 ...
Q-B6!

47 K-Q1
P-Q4:

Necessary! For instance, 47 ..., P-B5 at once is bad; $48 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch,
$\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 49 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $50 \mathrm{P}-$ B4!, K-B3; $51 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $52 \mathrm{P}-$ R5!, P-Q4 (52 ..., K-Q2; $53 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 54 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, K-B3; $56 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt4}$; $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$, K-B5; 58 P-Kt5!); 53 P-Kt5!, K-Q3 (53 ..., K-Q2; $54 \mathrm{P} \times$ BP ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 55 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 56 \mathrm{~K}-$ K 2 ); $54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ !, K-B2; $55 \mathrm{P}-$ Kt 6 ch , with a draw in every case.
48 R(6)-Kt3
After all White lets the Queen through to R3, but that does not alter the situation, as in any other case the advance of the KBP would decide.

| $48 \ldots$ | Q-Q5 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 49 K-K2 | Q-K5 ch |
| 50 K-Q2 | Q-B5 ch |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Q-R3 |
| $52 \mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3!$ |

White had set his last hope in 52 ..., P-B5; followed by 53 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, and a draw. Now Black's passed pawns cannot be halted; after $\mathrm{R} \times$ KKtP the King will be able to defend the BP.

| 53 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $54 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 55 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ |
| $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $57 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $58 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $59 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $60 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $61 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $62 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| $63 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt1}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| $64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| $65 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QP} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ |
| $66 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |

But supposing Black were to play hastily $66 \ldots$ K-B6; 67 R-B1, P-Kt7; 68 R-B3 and mate!

66 ..
K-R6

## Resigns

## NINETEEN TWENTY-NINE

All the winter of 1927/1928 I prepared for the competitive entrance examination for the Polytechnic Institute, and did not play chess at all, except for participating in the championship of the regional committee of the MetalWorkers' Trade Union. In August, 1928, I successfully passed the entrance examination and, rather belatedly, began my studies.

Naturally, now I had even less time for chess; but in January, 1929, I went to Moscow to take part in a team competition among the Higher Educational Institutions of Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov, and Tashkent. I had no special success, and my game with Poliak (No. 7) will give some idea of my rather diffident play during this period.

The reader may be surprised to see that in the July I was called upon to fight for the chess honour of the little town of Krechevitsa (and not of Leningrad) against the Master, V. Sozin. This is explained by the circumstance that we students spent the summer there, and when the local chessplayers had a match against those of Novgorod they naturally strengthened their team by drawing on the Polytechnic students. My game with Sozin was the only important game I played there.

In the September I was in Odessa, playing in the U.S.S.R. Sixth Championship. In my section of the quarter-finals I was first, but I was so exhausted (we had to play three games a day) that in the semi-finals I was not one of the victors-the first serious failure I had had to experience.

## EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS' TEAM COMPETITION, MOSCOW

January
No. 7. Queen's Gambit Declined
A. Poliak
(White)
M. Botvinnik
(Black)

| 1 | P-QB4 | Kt-KB3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Kt-QB3 | P-K3 |
| 3 | P-Q4 | P-Q4 |
| 4 | B-Kt5 | QKt-Q2 |
| 5 | P-K3 | P-QB3 |
| 6 | P-QR3 |  |

This move prevents the Cambridge Springs Defence. It was played by Capablanca in the fifth and by Alekhine in the 34th game of their match in 1927.

| $6 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $8 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |
| If at once $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, there may follow |  |

$8 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$; 10 B-Q3, P-QR3. After the text move Black has two possibilities: $8 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; and Kt-Q4 (Capablanca's usual system) and the less hackneyed $8 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$, as in this game.

| $8 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}}{ }$ | $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Of course, $9 \ldots, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ is worse; it would greatly weaken the Q side. In the position that has arisen it is inexpedient for White to follow Duras with 10 Q-R4, because of $10 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, and now not 11 B R6, .... because of P-Kt4. So White is forced to turn his attention to the K side.
10 B-Q3
$11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

A mistake, after which Black equalizes without difficulty. Correct is $11 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, preventing $11 \ldots$, Kt-K5.
$11 \ldots$
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$
$12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
In all other continuations Black would hold K5, with a good game.

| $12 \ldots$ | $B \times B$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 15 | Q-Q3 |
| $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

16 P-B4
A rather risky move.
Black should now have played $16 \ldots$, Q-K2, with quite a good game. The Queen's retreat to B3 causes some complications.

| 16 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4!$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 18 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 19 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{QB})-\mathrm{K} 1!$ |  |

(QB)-K1!
There is nothing in $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, P-R3! (but not $19 \ldots$... Q-K6 ch; $20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 2$ !); 20 Kt-R7, Q-K6ch.
19 ...
P-QB4

At first glance a move of doubtful value, but in reality the only acceptable one. $19 \ldots$, QR-Q1; 20 QKKt3 is bad, with much unpleasantness for Black.
If now $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, then $20 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $22 \mathrm{~K}-$ $\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ (or $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ), with at least a draw for Black. White could force a draw also with $20 \mathrm{P}-$ Q5, P-B4; 21 P-Q6, P×Kt; 22 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q})$ ch, which he should have done.
$20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5} \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
During play I overlooked that after $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; 22 K-B2, R-K2; 23 $\mathrm{Kt} \times$ RP Black has a simple but convincing reply in $23 \ldots$, B-K5! affording every chance of a win.

## Position after Black's 20th move



How should White play now? It is not so simple to decide this question correctly. He loses after $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 7$. $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$, Q-Q4 is obviously bad. There remains the sole and strongest move, 21 R-K5! depriving Black of Q4, but it seems Black could have drawn in this case too, for instance: 21 R K 5 !, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ !; $22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ !, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 2$ !, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} ; 25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3!; 26 \mathrm{R}-$ B2, P-KR3!; $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $28 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$, P-Q6.
$21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{RP}$
Q-Q4!

Evidently White had not foreseen the Black Queen's interesting manœuvre. He was reckoning only on $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch.
22 Q-R3
23 K-R1
$\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ ch
24 R-B1

If $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 24 \ldots, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, still forcing the R's retreat to B1. Nor is $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, of use; $24 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, and the Black King retreats from check to K2

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} c h$ |
| $26 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ |  |

Refusal to exchange the smaller

| pieces would not bring any essential <br> change. | Desperation! |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $27 \ldots$ | $34 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
| $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| $29 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| $30 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| $32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 8)$ | $\mathrm{KR} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $39 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 5$ | $40 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |  | Resigns |  |

## KRECHEVITSA-NOVGOROD MATCH

## July

| No. 8. Quee | mbit Declined | 11 | P-KR3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M. Botvinnik | V. Sozin | $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | R-K1 |
| M. Botvinnik | V. Sozin | 13 Q-Q2 | Kt-B1 |
| (White) | (Black) | 14 QR-Q1 | B-Q3 |
| $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 | $15 \mathrm{Kt-K5}$ | Q-K2 |

Position after Black's 15th move

$16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !
A purely positional sacrifice. For his Bishop White gets two pawns. But the destruction of the Black K side and the ease with which White can transfer his major pieces to that side make it justifiable to assume that White's attack will be almost irresistible.

| $16 \ldots$ | $P \times B$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

Black realizes that sooner or later the White Knight will have to be eliminated. He decides to do so now,
so as to have some counter-play, arising from $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$.
$18 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
$18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(3)-\mathrm{R} 2$ loses at once; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
19 Q-B4
P-KB4
$20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ e.p.
After 20 P-KR3, Kt-Kt3; 21 Q$\mathrm{Kt} 3, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$; $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ equality of material would be restored, but I preferred to continue the attack.

| 20 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 22 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3)-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | QR-Q1 |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |  |

It seems 25 P-B4 gave grounds for a win. In face of the strong threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 5$ Black has nothing better than $25 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, but then $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, with the unanswerable threats of $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B})-\mathrm{Kt4}$ or $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$. Choosing 25 Kt-Kt5, I overlooked Black's 30th move.

| $25 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 30 P 2 |  |
| $30-\mathrm{KR} 4$ | B-B1 |
|  | R(K)-Kt1 |

The strongest! Black threatens $31 \ldots$, Q-B4, seizing the initiative. So the text continuation is the only one for White.
$31 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$
Q-B4
$31 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ was no use; 32 R-Q4, Q-R3 (32 ..., Q-K2; 33 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ loses a piece); $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ ! But now the position is approximately equal, though Biack must fight for a draw because of the three White linked passed pawns.

| $32 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |


| 35 | P-QKt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 | R-Q6 |
| 37 | P-KKt4 |
| 38 | K-B2 |
| 39 | R-Q2 |
| R-Q2 | K-B1 |
|  | K-K2 |
|  |  |


| 56 |  | K-B4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 57 | K-K7 | K-Kt3 |

Position after Black's 57th move


A position that deserves a note. Obviously, if it is Black's move he loses. So White must win a tempo. He can do this by $58 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 7!$, K-B4 (58 ..., B-R2; $59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6$, or if 58 ..., K-B2; 59 P-B5, B-R2; 60

P-Kt6 ch, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$; $61 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathbf{P}$, Black lacks one tempo for a draw); 59 K-K8!, K-Kt3; 60 K-K7! and wins. Instead, White provokes Black to transfer his Bishop to the diagonal R2-Kt8, hoping for an even easier win; but it transpires that the resulting position is inadequate.

| 58 K-K8 | B-K3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 59 K-B8 | B-B4 |
| 60 K-K7 | B-B7 |
| 61 K-Q6 | B-Q6 |
| 62 K-K6 | B-B5 ch |
| 63 K-K7 |  |

Only now did White see that 63 K-K5, B-Q6; 64 P-B5 ch, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $65 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 66 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$ leads to a draw, as the BK will succeed in getting to R1. So after a few more moves the opponents agreed to a draw.

A game interesting in all its stages.

## U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP

Semi-Finals

## Odessa, September

No. 9. Queen's Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik | B. Silich |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

This well-known variation is of little benefit to Black, as it is difficult for him to prevent $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. Best of all here is probably $4 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ to sharpen the struggle. In Black's text continuation White gets a very strong centre.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | P-K3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | P-K4 | B-Kt5 |
| 6 | B-Q3 | B $\times$ Kt ch |

This exchange, doubling the White pawns, is necessary, as after $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

White could recapture the Bishop with Knight.

| $7 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| To block the | doubled BPs. |
| 9 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

Both sides' plans are now defined White intends to attack in the centre, Black intends to Castle on the $Q$ side, an idea approximately that of Capablanca's game in an analogous position against Kmoch a little earlier (Budapest, 1928).
11 P-Q5
Kt-QR4!

The White pawn on B 4 is weak. $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $13 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is clearly to Black's advantage. So White regroups forces
to attack in the centre and simultaneously to defend B4.
$12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

13 Q-K2
$14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ now constitutes a serious threat, so Black attempts a counterattack.

| $13 \ldots$ | P-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

If $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 17 \mathrm{~B}-$ $\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KBP}$ !
$15 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$
$K t \times \mathbf{Q P}$

After $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP} ; 17$ B-B4, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QB} 3 ; 18$ $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP} ; 19 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ White has a strong attack.

## 16 P-B5 P-K4

Of course, the only chance. Black intends after P-R5 and P-B3 to keep the centre closed, and exploit good prospects on the wings.

| $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6!$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

At first sight a brilliant move, which would seem to defeat White's plan, as after $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ ! Black's game is the better.
Yet he should have played $18 \ldots$, P-K5; $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $20 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{KR} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} ; 21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, though in this case also White's game is to be preferred.

Position after Black's 18th move

$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$
Apparently Black overlooked this manœuvre.

| $19 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

After $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ follows $22 \mathrm{~B}-$ $\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 5$, and mate next move.
$22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$
Now the counter-attack is repulsed, and Black must lose.

| 22 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Pch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| 26 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{~K} 1$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $28 \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

## NINETEEN THIRTY

The lesson I had received in Odessa was not wasted. Study at the Institute continued to take up much of my time, but when I again sat down at a chess board in the winter of 1930 I had never before, perhaps, felt such determination to win.

In the Tournament of Leningrad Masters I frequently got into a difficult situation (see Games 10 and 11) but almost always I found a way to create complications. In the end I won first place; this was my first success among masters.

The three games $(13,14,15)$ against the Master I. Kann, were all played in Leningrad-Moscow matches. It must be remarked that after Kann had won a game against me in the Sixth U.S.S.R. Championship (Odessa, 1929) and had occupied third place, there were many who considered that "a check had been found" for Botvinnik too. This opinion was confirmed when Kann beat me again, winning the second game in the Leningrad--Moscow match of May, 1930. But in the autumn all that was silenced; in the next match played between the teams of the two capitals Kann lost both his games against me.
1930 marked a turning-point: I learned the art of winning regularly against masters.

LENINGRAD MASTERS' TOURNAMENT
March

| No. 10. Two Knights' Defence |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| V. Ragozin (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-K4 |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-QB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | Kt -B3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 6 R-K1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 7 Kt -B3 |  |

This move was introduced into tournament practice by Canal. Recently several good continuations have been found against it. But Black prefers to transpose the game back to the variation following $7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$.

| $7 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $13 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QBP}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

14 B-K3
The beginning of all White's later difficulties. True, also bad were $14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; and $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ! winning the exchange, but after the simple continuation $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and preparing B-B4 White would appear to have equalized the game.

| $14 \ldots$ | P-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | R-B4 |

With the strong threat $16 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$. As before, it is unprofitable for White to take the BP.
16 P-KKt4
This aggressive sally weakens the K side. However, the other continuation, $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, is also favourable to Black, after 17 ..., B-K3.

| $16 \ldots$ | R-KKt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 P-KB3 | P-KR4! |
| 18 | P-KR4 |

Position after Black's 18th move


Black lets slip a good winning chance. $18 \ldots$, R-Q4!; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3!$; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ (or $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, and wins), $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $21 \mathrm{R} \times$ B(R3), B-B4! (but not $21 \ldots$,
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 ; 23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ !, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$, which leads to a draw); $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; 23 P $\times$ P, P-B6; 24 R-KKt6 R-K1, etc. After Black's text move White can equalize the game again.

## 19 P-Kt5 <br> P-R4

Necessary. At R2 the pawn was weak.
$\begin{array}{ll}20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3 \\ 21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3\end{array}$
22 R-B3
This sacrifice of the exchange was quite sound and should have led to a draw. White would have lost after $22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, because of $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, winning a piece; or after $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, B-Kt2; $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ( $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ), $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 ; 25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ with the stronger attack. But now, owing to the closed nature of the position, the game acquires a drawn character.

| 22 | B-Kt5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 23 R-Kt3 | B-B5 |
| $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $B \times R$ |
| $25 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{B}$ | B-B1 |
| 26 P-Kt4 | P-R5 |
| 27 K-B1 | KR-K1 |
| $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | P-B4 |
| $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | KR-Kt1? |
| $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | R-Kt6 ? |

The King should have been brought up.
$31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
After this White even has winning chances, as he captures the RP.

P-Kt3
To exchange Bishops at any rate.

| $33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $34 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3!$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| $35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $36 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |

At this, for Black, critical stage the game was adjourned. True, he gets the passed pawn, but even so the
threatened advance of the White QKtP is even more dangerous.
Position after Black's 37th move


| $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KBP}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $40 \mathrm{P} \times$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \mathrm{c}$ |

The only possible! It is easy to see that after $40 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6$; $41 \mathrm{P}-$ Kt 7 , R-Q1 ch; $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$; $43 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! White wins.
41 K-B4
Not $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 42 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, R-B4!; 43 P-Kt7, R-Kt4.
$41 \ldots$
R-K6
$42 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$
Unusually attractive, but dangerous. White could force a draw by playing 42 R-R2!, R-B1 ch; 43 K-Kt4, R-K3; 44 K-Kt5 (not 44 P-Kt7, R-Kt3 ch), R-K4 ch; 45 K-Kt4 (45 K-R6, R-R1 ch), R-K3, and both sides must repeat moves.
42 ...
R-K5 ch
43 Kt -Q4
Not, of course, $43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $44 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$, and the pawn is queened.

| $43 \ldots$ | P-B6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44. R-R2 | R-B1 ch |
| 45 K-Kt4! |  |

Again forced! The King has five ways of retreat, but only one sound way. The following continuations would have been fatal to White. (1)

45 K-Q3 (or 45 K-Kt3), R-K2; and $46 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, winning the pawn. (2) $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$; 46 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \mathrm{ch}!; 47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} 2$ (3) $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, R-K4 ch; $46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$, and Black wins.

| 45 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| 47 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 48 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| 49 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

Position after Black's 49th move


The only practical possibility of continuing the attempt to win; but, as N . Grigoriev pointed out, after $50 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$; $51 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$; $52 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ !; $53 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$, R-Kt1; $54 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$ White draws. White's following text mistake leads immediately to denouement.
$50 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ ?
R-K6 ch

The only way. The White King is forced to occupy a disadvantageous position (on the file of his advanced pawn).

## No. 11. Four Knights' Game

## J. Rochlin <br> (White)

M. Botvinnik

| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 Kt-KB3 | Kt-QB3 |
| 3 Kt-B3 | B-Kt5 |
| 4 B-Kt5 | Kt-B3 |

$51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
R-K7
52 R-R1
P-B7
$53 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$

Desperation! But 53 R-KB1, R-KB1; $54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7} \mathrm{ch}$; and $55 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ is also hopeless for White.
53 ...
R-K8
54 R-R8
Or 54 P-Kt7, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$.
$54 \ldots$
P-B8(Q)
$55 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ dis. ch
After $55 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} \mathfrak{6}$ dis. ch, K-B2!; $56 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $57 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ Black has an easy win.

| 55 | K-Kt2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $56 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-B1 |
| $57 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ | R-Kt8 ch |
| 58 K-B5 | Q-B4 ch |
| $59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $60 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | Q-Q2 ch |
| $61 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt8} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $62 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $63 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-Kt2 |

Despite mistakes on both sides, this was an interesting game, especially in its closing stage.

On the adjournment at move 37 I analysed the position very thoroughly right down to move 48. $49 \ldots$, R-Q1! was found at the board, not at home. None the less I was very proud of this analysis, as hitherto I had been very weak in this branch.
$5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
The usual move is $50-\mathrm{O}$, and then 6 P-Q3. True, Black does not now obtain the decisive advantage which White gets in the analogous variation $5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ !, but in any case one can reckon Black's opening difficulties as eliminated.
$5 \ldots$
Kt-Q5

ONE HUNDRED SELECTED GAMES

| 6 B-R4 | P-QKt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 7 B-Kt3 | P-Q4 |

Seemingly the most energetic. 7 ..., P-Q3 might be followed by 8 P-R3! and White has nothing to fear. But now there is the threat of $8 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, also $8 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch; $9 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$. So White's reply is admittedly the best.

$$
8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP} \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}
$$

The first mistake. Correct is 8 ..., Q-K2!; 9 P-B4 (9 B-KB4, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $10 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 11 \mathrm{P}-$ QR3, B-Q3; $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2)$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; and White has a very difficult game.
$9 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
An obvious blunder! With $9 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ Black would get at least an equal game. After the text move he loses a pawn.
10 Kt -B6
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}$
$11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$

Not, of course, $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ch, and Black wins the exchange. I chose this continuation because I counted on winning a piece with $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! etc., and only afterward noticed that $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is followed by 12 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathbf{Q} 2$, and the Knight is protected! Black's following attempt to break through the White centre is a still better possibility.

| $11 \ldots$ | P-B4! |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \underset{\text { Kt-B2 }}{ }$ | P-B5 |

A very interesting position. White gains no advantage with $13 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ ch; $14 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{R}-$ $\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 ; 16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \mathrm{ch}$; nor with $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ !; 14 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch} ; 15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; and the doubled extra pawn is of no essential importance. The continuation White chose seems the most natural.

Position after Black's 12th move

$13 \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{Kt} 3) \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathbf{K t P} \times \mathbf{P}$
14 P-K5! $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$

Now not $14 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; 17 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$; and White has an extra pawn.
15 P-Q4
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$16 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} \quad$ Q-R4 ch
17 Q-Q2!

Thoroughly sound! In returning the pawn White gets a very favourable endgame. Retiring the King 17 K-B1, R-QKt1; 18 B-R3, B-B4 would lead to a complicated and uncertain game.

| $17 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ |
| $19 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |

21 R-B4 ;
A stereotyped move, after which the advantage passes to Black. More logical is $21 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ ! exploiting the undefended Black Bishop. E.g. 21 QR-Kt1, P-QR4 (preventing the unpleasant $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ ); $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, B-Q4; 23 R-Kt5, B-B3; 24 R-Kt6, B-Q4; 25 R-B4, with a difficult game for Black.

## 21 P-B6

Black seizes control of QKt8 and KB8. To cap it all, the Rook at B4 is in danger.
22 B-R3 Kt-Q7

23 B-B5
White underestimates the seriousness of the Rook's position. The best was $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$; 24 K-Q3, R-B1; $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $26 K \times P$.
$23 \ldots \quad$ P-Kt4
24 R-Kt4
The only retreat! 24 R-B5 loses (B-K5), and after $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ or R-B6, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ and then $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$.

| $24 \ldots$ | P-KR3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

Position after White's 26th move


A losing move, as Black can bring the stranded King's Rook into play. More chances in 26 P-KR4, P-KR4 (but not 26 ..., Kt-B5 ch; 27 KB 2 !, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ); $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 ; 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$,

No. 12. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik | S. Gotthilf |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt -R3 |

Until this game I had always regarded $5 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ as weak. I had formed this opinion as the result
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 30 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$. White must have now been counting only on $26 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ with a probable draw, but things went a little differently.
$26 \ldots \quad$ P-B4!

The whole point! Now White will not have the blocking move B-K7, and the King's Rook comes into play with decisive effect.

| 28 | B-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 Kt-Kt4 | K $\times P$ |
| 30 K-Q3 | KR-K1 ch |
| Kt-K5 |  |

Winning the exchange at least.
31 R-B1 ch K-Kt3
There is no defence to $32 \ldots$. P-R4, while 32 P-KR4 is met by 32 K-R4.

| $32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathbf{R} 6$ |

$34 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ at once is simpler.

| $35 \mathrm{Kt-Q3}$ | B-B4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | B-K5 |
| $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | P-R4 |
| $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | P-R5 |
| $39 \mathrm{Kt-R2}$ | P-Kt5 |
| $40 \mathrm{Kt-B3}$ | B-B6 |
| 41 B-Q6 | R(B)-Q1 |
| $42 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | P-R6 |
| $43 \mathrm{Kt-Kt5}$ | B-Kt7 |
| Resigns |  |

of the fourth game in the first match between Alekhine and Bogoljubov, in which to $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ Alekhine continued $6 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch and got a bad game.

| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

When analysing this game I came to the conclusion that after $7 \ldots$, P-QKt3 White has no advantage at all, and in the same year, playing

Black, I adopted this system against I. Kann (see Game No. 15).

## 8 B-Kt5 <br> B-K2

The only way to relieve the pin at KB3; in addition the Bishop vacates B 4 for the Knight.

## 9 P-K4 P-Q3

Defence against the threat P-K5. Perhaps here too $9 \ldots$, P-QKt3 would be better. In that case the Queen's Bishop develops at once along the diagonal QR1-KR8 and, as compared with the text continuation, Black saves a tempo. If after $9 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt3}$; $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, then 10 ..., Kt-K1.
10 B-K2
B-Q2
11 O-O

Not, of course, $11 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 12 Q-Kt4, P-QR4.

| 11 | $\ldots$ | B-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Q-B2 | P-KR3 |
| 13 | B-B4 | Kt-B4 |
| 14 | P-K5 |  |

The only move, consolidating White's advantage. After $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, P-Q4!; 15 P-K5, KKt-K5 Black has a fair game. But now White obtains a pawn majority on the Q side (three pawns against two).

$$
14 \ldots
$$

KKt-K5
The best continuation, as by exchanging Bishops Black makes defence easier. $14 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ would be bad. Now it seems that Black has a perfectly satisfactory position, as in the struggle for K 5 he has even emerged victor; however, the ensuing discharge of the tension in the centre reveals the weaknesses of his position.

| $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 QR-Q1 | Q-K2 |

Not $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$, and $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times$ B

## $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !



White's advantage is determined by this move. Instead of the strong Bishop at B3 Black is left with a weak pawn and his Knights, deprived of Bishop support, are driven out of the centre. If now $18 \ldots$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} ; 19 \mathrm{~K} \times$ B, Q-Kt4 ch; $20 \mathrm{Kt}-$ Kt4.

| 18 | $\ldots$ | KR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |
| 21 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

With this retreat Black condemns himself to passive defence, but it is doubtful whether the more active $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B4 would be better, because of: 22 Q-R4, KR-B1; 23 Kt-K4!, P-QR4; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

| 22 | Q-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 | B-R6 |
| 24 | Kt K-K4 |
| $25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |

It is interesting that this natural move leads to a forced lose. But it has to be remarked that Black's position is now difficult to defend.

The other possible variation, 25 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; planning $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ after 26 R-Q6, Q-K1; 27 P-Kt5!, BP $\times$ P; $28 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$; 29 Q-Q4 would also lead to a difficult situation for Black.

After the text move White seizes the Q file.

| 26 R-Q3! | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |



Black is helpless! He cannot simultaneously defend himself against White's two threats: 29 Q-Q1, capturing the Q file; and $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ! E.g. $28 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} t 5!, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (otherwise $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ ); $31 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$, and Black loses the Knight.

| 29 | Q-Q1 | K-R2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | R-Q8 | P-Kt3 |
| 31 | P-Kt3 | Kt-B3 |
| 32 | Q-Q6 | Kt-Q4 |

Now Black can move nothing but the King, and White has only to find the shortest road to victory. The Bishop's following manœuvre is this road.

| 33 | B-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 34 | B-Kt3 |
| 35 | K-R4 |
| 36 | R-QR2 |
| K-R2 |  |
| K-Kt2 |  |

## 36 R-QR8

Obviously, not at once $36 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$; and White loses a piece. But now there is the threat of $37 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 38 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} ; 39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, and White wins.

| $36 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $37 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q} 2$ |
| $38 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $39 \mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ |

At this point the game was adjourned. After the obvious $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ two main variations are possible:
(1) $41 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $42 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, P-Q6; 43 R-Q7, R-K4; 44 P-QR4, R-K5; $45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 46 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $47 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ and wins.
(2) 41 ..., P-Q6; $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$, R-K3 ch; 43 K-Q1!, R-K7; 44 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 46 R-Kt3.

And so Black resigned without resuming play.

## LENINGRAD-MOSCOW TRADE UNION MATCH

 MayNo. 13. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik (White) | I. Kann (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt5 |
| $4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | P-B4 |
| $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

At this time the defence system beginning with 5 ..., Kt-QR3!
followed by P-QKt3 was not yet known (see Game No. 15).

## 6 Kt -B3 Kt -B3

A passive plan of development.

## 7 B-Kt5

P-QKt3

Black underestimates White's ensuing reply. It would be risky to play $7 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$; 8 Q-B2 ( 8 Q-R4, Q-Kt3), $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, etc., but probably the best move is $7 \ldots$, Q-Kt3, forcing exchange of
queens. Of course, even now White's game is obviously the better.
8 P-K4 Kt-Q5
It is difficult to suggest anything better. E.g. after $8 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QKt2}$; $9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP} ; 10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{KR} 3 ; 11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, R-Kt1; $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ White has a decisive attack.
$9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$
With this simple move, eliminating the threat of $10 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch White consolidates his advantage in the centre. Black's next move, obviously, is the only way of freeing the Kt at B3.
10 ...
P-KR3
11 B-B4
Not so good is $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$; $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}(12 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P})$ and the entire pawn position is spoilt. Now there is a threat of $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ and 12 B-Q6.
11 Kt-Kt5 $\quad$ P-K4
Forced. Bad would be $12 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; or $12 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times$ $\mathrm{KtP} ; 13 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ !
$13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$
After $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt3}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ (or $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$, K-B1; 18 P-B5, Q-R4; 19 P-Kt4, Q-Kt3; 20 Q-Q5, QR-Kt1; 21 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1), \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 18$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 ; 19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ! White should win.

```
\(14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}\)
K-B1
```

15 P-B5!
A very important intermediate move, threatening $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ mate. If White were to play at once 15 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, Black, by continuing $15 \ldots$, Q-R5 ch; 16 Q-B2 (16 P-Kt3, followed by $16 \ldots \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$,

Q-B3! loses a pawn) could obtain an exchange of Queens.


After this move Black must inevitably lose material, Because of the threat $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ it is necessary for Black to take at B4, and this puts the Queen's Bishop in danger.
17 ...
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$
K-Kt1

There is no other defence against $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$. But if at once $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$, then $19 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$.

| $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 21 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| O-O-O |  |

There is no hurry about taking the pawn at KB2; e.g. 21 ..., P-B3 is bad. 22 P-B4!.

The, to White, attractive move 21 Q-B7 (threatening $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ) fails because of $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Bl}$ !; 22 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$.
$21 \ldots$
P-QR4
$22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$
B-R3
$23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ そ

Played carelessly! Now Black can cause complications. The right move is $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$, withdrawing the Queen from the threat of $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ and defending the KBP.

NINETEEN THIRTY
 forces further simplification advantageous to himself. $30 \ldots, \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{R})-$ Kt 3 may be followed by $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ (or $31 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; 32 $\mathrm{R}(7) \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ and $34 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P})$; $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}$; $33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $34 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, etc.

| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $31 \mathrm{R}(1) \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 36 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt} 4) \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| R $(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

## LENINGRAD-MOSCOW MATCH

November

| No. 14. Dutch Defence |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | M. Botvinnik |
| $\quad$ (White) | I. Kann |
| (Black) |  |
| 1 P-Q4 | P-K3 |
| 2 | P-QB4 |
| 3 Kt-KB3 | P-KB4 |
| 4 B-Q2 | B-Kt5 ch |
| B $\times$ B ch |  |

38 R-Kt7 ch
Black can reply to $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ with $38 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; with chances of a draw.

| $38 \ldots$ | K-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 R(K)-B7 ch! | K-K4 |
| 40 R-B2 | P-Q4 |

Position after Black's 40th move


The game was adjourned in this position. The match judges ( N . Grigoriev and P. Romanovsky) awarded White the win, taking into account the following variations which I put forward. $41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ !, K-Q3; $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; $43 \mathrm{R}-$ R7, winning a second pawn. Or 41 ..., K-Q5; 42 R-Q2 ch, K-B4; $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ (also $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; 44 R-QR7, R-Kt4; 45 R-KR7), K-B3 (43 . . ., R-Q3; $44 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \mathrm{ch}$ ); $44 \mathrm{R}(7) \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch} ; 45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $46 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; and White wins the pawn ending easily.

| $5 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |

A mistake, after which Black runs into serious difficulties. As is well known, here it is necessary to aim at P-K4, to achieve which Black should play $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.
$7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

7 ..., B-Kt2 has the unpleasant reply 8 P-Q5 with an excellent game for White. But now 8 P-Q5 has the reply $8 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. Nor is there any advantage in $7 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 8 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ( $9 \ldots$, B-Kt2; 10 Q-K3); $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$.

## 8 B-Kt2 B-Kt2 <br> 9 O-O $\quad$ Q-K2

Consolidating K3. No benefit could be derived from $9 \ldots$, O-O; 10 P-Q5!, P-K4; $11 \mathrm{Kt-KKt5}$, B-B1; $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 13 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, etc.
$10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
P-K4
Otherwise $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.
11 P-K4!
The most energetic. There is nothing to be gained by $11 \mathrm{Kt-Kt5}$, QKt-Q2; $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ with an equal game.
$11 \ldots$, B-B1 could be followed by $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $13 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; 14 Kt -Q4, B-Q2; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, with obvious superiority. So the continuation Black chooses is relatively the best. However, his game must already be regarded as unsatisfactory.

| $11 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt5}$ | $\mathrm{QKt-Q} 2$ |
| $13 \mathrm{QKt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

3 QKt $\times \mathrm{P}$
Also bad is $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 14 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}$-B3; $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

| $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

No other way! Nothing comes of $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; 17 Q-K3, Kt-Kt4 (or $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 18 P-QKt4!); 18 P-B4! (but not $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ with an excellent game for Black) without sufficient compensation for loss of the exchange.

## 16 Q-B2

Of course, not at once $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$, because of $16 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ and
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}(4)$. White attacks KRP and simultaneously defends the pawn at B4; Black has two pawns under threat, and he cannot defend both at once.
16 ...
R-R3

Black overlooks a better possibility, consisting in the variation $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1 ; 17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{QR} \times$ Kt ; $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$, B-B1; and although White should win, the exploitation of his extra pawn still involves great technical difficulties. Instead, Black seeks salvation in attack, which is predestined to failure.

## $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ QBP <br> R-QB1

$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
$18 \mathrm{Kt-K} 6$ would be a blunder, because of $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, after which White cannot escape simultaneously from two threats: (1) $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, and (2) $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B} ; 20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

| $18 \ldots$ | P-QR3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{Kt-R7}$ | R-B1 |
| $20 \mathrm{Kt-B6}$ | Q-Kt4 |

20 Kt -B6 Q-Kt4
$20 \ldots$, Q-B2; $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is still worse.
21 B-Kt2 Kt-B3
Position after Black's 21st move


Allowing an amusing finish. It is possible for Black to resist longer by playing: $21 \ldots$, B-B1. Against this move the following variation had
been prepared: $22 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1$; $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 23 P-B4, Q-R4; 24 P-KR4, P $\times$ P; $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4;} \mathrm{26} \mathrm{B-B3!} \mathrm{and}$ win.

$$
22 \text { Q-B5 } \quad \text { Q-R4 }
$$

Defeat follows at once after $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 24 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$, and $25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$.
$23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$

After $23 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, R-R6 (24 ..., R-Kt4; 25 P-R4); 25 K-Kt2, R-R3; $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ K-R1; 27 Kt -B5 Black loses another pawn.
24 P-B4! R-K1

No. 15. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| I. Kann (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-QB4 | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-B4 |
| 3 Kt -B3 | P-K3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | B-Kt5 |
| 6 Q-Kt3 | B-B4 |

It is difficult to indicate a better continuation here. After $6 \ldots$. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 7 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 8$ $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, White's position is unquestionably preferable; but $6 \ldots$, Kt-R3, 7 B-Kt5 leads only to transposition of moves as compared with the text game.
7 Kt -B3
In sum we have a variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defence analogous to Game No. 12. Of course, I too continued to defend in the same manner as Gotthilf, with the difference that I refrained from the unnecessary move $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.

| $7 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |

9 Q-B2
B-Kt2
Preparing P-K4, which is not sound at once because of $9 \ldots$,

Defending the pawn. Defeat also follows $24 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$ !, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 ; 26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1 ; 28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ mate. Or $25 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$; $27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$, and $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q})$.

| 25 | QR-K1 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | P $\times$ B | Kt-B3 |
| 27 | P-KKt4 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 28 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K P}$ |
| 29 | B-Q5 ch | K-R1 |
|  | P-B7 |  |

Or $30 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$; $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$.
31 B-Kt7
Resigns
P-KR3 (10 B-R4, P-KKt4; 11 B$\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P})$.

| 9 | $\ldots$ | P-KR3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | B-R4 | O-O |
| 11 | P-K4 | B-K2 |
| 12 | B-K2 | Kt-R3 |

13 P-K5
Obviously the best. $13 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ would be followed by $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and White would not be in a state to hold K4, e.g. $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ (14 P-K5, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5), \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $15 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}(15 \mathrm{~B} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 16 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; and $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}), \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}!$; $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, with approximately equal game.
$13 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt} 5$
If now 14 Q-Kt1 (to prevent 14 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5)$ then $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ (otherwise $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ), $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $17 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 18 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; \quad$ and Black's game is no worse than White's.

| $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $17 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

18 QR-Q1
A faulty move, transferring the initiative to Black. Stronger is

18 KR-Q1 or $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, Kt-B3 (18 ..., P-B3; $19 \mathrm{Kt-Kt5}, \mathrm{Kt-B3;}$ $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt3}$; $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 22 QR-Q1, with advantage to White) $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, with simplification of the position.
$18 \ldots$
$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$
It would be disadvantageous to White to win back the pawn at once with 19 R-R1, Kt-Kt5; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, because of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}(22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}), \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-Q4! But now, as the White Knight threatens an invasion of Q6, the Black Knight must hurriedly retreat.
$19 \ldots \quad$ Kt-Kt5

Only thus! Bad for Black is 20 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, B-Kt3 because of 22 P-B4 with the threat of $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$. Now White gains nothing from the continuation 21 Kt-Q6, B-R1. So he is compelled to take the QRP, regardless of the fact that his Knight is then out of play.
$21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$
Here Black proposed to play: 21 ..., P-Q4; $22 \mathrm{P} \times$ P e.p., B-B7; 23 R-B1, R $\times$ P; but rejected this continuation at the last moment, noticing that after $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7!, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $24 R \times B$, it was not so easy to deal with the passed pawn at Q7.
$22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$
23 Q-Q4
Other possible variations, namely: 23 Kt-Kt5, P-Q4; $24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}$; $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$; or $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$; with the subsequent transfer of the Black Knight to Q5 are also not very favourable to White.
23 ...
P-Q4
$24 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ Kt-B3
With this move Black unites his pawns, and secures a superior endgame.
$26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$
27 R -B1

Leads to speedy defeat because of the forced march of the Black QP. A rather better move is $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 28 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} \mathrm{ch} ; 29$ K-R1, R-B3; but because of his passed pawn and the poor position of the enemy King Black would still have adequate prospects of a win.
$27 \ldots \quad$ P-Q5!
Position after Black's 27th move


28 P-B3
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ at once results in a transposition of moves.
$28 \ldots$
P-Q6
29 B-Q1

Or $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 30 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$
( $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ ), R-Q7; $31 \mathrm{Kt} \rightarrow$ B3 (31 R $\times$ P, R-Q8; 32 R-QB1, R-B8 ch), Kt-Q5.
29 ...
$30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$
P-Q7
$31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$
B-Q6
$31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$
B $\times \mathrm{Kt}$
R-K3
33 R-B1
34 R-QB5

NINETEEN THIRTY-ONE
Swifter defeat would have followed on $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 1 ; 35 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \mathrm{ch}$, K-R1; 36 R-Q5, R(1)-K7 ch. After the text move Black could not play $34 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, because of 35 K-B2, R(Q)-K1; 36 R-Q5! and White has the advantage.

| 34 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 35 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 36 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{K}$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |
| 39 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} 4$ |
|  | Resigns |

## NINETEEN THIRTY-ONE

In 1931 I took part in two big tournaments: during the winter in the Leningrad Championship, and in the autumn in the Seventh All-Union Championship, in Moscow.
In the Leningrad Championship I won first place easily, beating the runner up, P. Romanovsky, by $2 \frac{1}{2}$ points. The games from this tournament (Nos. 16, 17, 18) witness to my increased mastery. By now I had achieved no small successes in the study of chess, not excluding the opening game, but I had not yet learnt thoroughly how to prepare for competitions.
There were still periods when I could not give much time to chess; in the summer I worked for some six weeks or so on the Dnieper Construction Works, doing practical work as a student. Naturally, this was a dubious sort of preparation for the forthcoming All-Union Championship.

It was not surprising that even in the semi-finals I stumbled and lost two games in succession. Only with my win over G. Kasparyan (Game 19) did I put my affairs in good order, but even so I had to be satisfied with second place, Kasparyan being first.

In the finals of the tournament I started badly: my lose in the first round to Ilyin-Zhenevsky, who simply made mincemeat of me, and my further lose in the seventh round, put me $1 \frac{1}{2}$ points behind the leader, Master N. Riumin. But then I got a move on and, collecting $6 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of a possible seven, drew up quite close to the leader. We met in the 15 th round (Game No. 24). Speculation rose to a great height: all chess Moscow was on the side of its talented champion, Riumin. However, he went in for great complications without adequate justification and lost the deciding game. So I managed to win the coveted title of Champion of the U.S.S.R.

LENINGRAD CHAMPIONSHIP

| March |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. 16. Ni | dian Defence | $3 \mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ | B-Kt5 |
| M. Botvinnik | G. Myasoyedov | $4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | P-B4 |
| (White) | (Black) | ${ }_{5} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{P}} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-B3 |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 | 7 B-Q2 | $\mathbf{K t} \times$ QBP |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 | 8 Q-B2 | P-B4 |


| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |

So far, as in the Stahlberg-Alekhine game (Hamburg, 1930), which ended in White's defeat. In commenting on that game Kmoch pointed out that instead of the $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ which was played the best continuation was 12 B-Kt2, P-QKt3, though this also was in Black's favour. The present game seems to show that even in that case Black's game is no better.

## 12 B-Kt2 P-QKt3

Simpler would have been $12 \ldots$, P-Q3, as in the game Winter-SultanKhan (Hastings, Christmas 1930). But now a little surprise awaits Black.

## 13 P-Kt4

Position after White's 13th move


This interesting move had been previously studied in home analysis and, now at last, applied in practice.
If I had foreseen what complications this novelty would lead to I would in all probability have given my preference to the calm continuation $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$.

13 ...

## $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B P}$ !

All other continuations led to opening up the Knight file, after which White's position, with the

Bishop at QKt2 and the Rook at KKt1 would look threatening.

For that matter, White had taken this Knight sacrifice also into account. I foresaw that Black would not be able to recapture, and ended my analysis at that. But, as often happens, mistakes occur in home analysis too, to be refuted by actual play. White does in fact retain his piece, but he comes under strong attack.

| $14 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |

## 16 K-K3

It is easy to see that this is now the only move; if, e.g. $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt3}$; $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ! Or $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$; $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, Kt-Q5! to Black's advantage.
$16 \ldots \quad$ Q-R3ch
17 K-B2 Q-R5 ch
Black is compelled to resort to perpetual check. A false scent would be $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ ! Or $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 18 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, and White alone would gain.
18 K-K3
Q-R3 ch
$19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

This is the very position White had studied, regarding it as favourable to himself. However, at the board, only after great hesitation did he decide on taking the King for such a daring walk.

$$
19 \ldots \quad \text { P-Q4! }
$$

The strongest move! There was nothing good to be obtained from $19 \ldots$, Q-Kt3 ch; $20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; or 19 ..., P-K4; 20 Q-Q2!, Q-Q3 ch; $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$.
20 Q-B1!
The only reply, securing the King's retreat. Not 20 Q-Q2, Q-Kt3 ch;

21 K-B3, Q-K5!; 22 Q-Kt5, P-K4! and White's position is critical.

Now it may appear that White is getting out of the wood, but Black, consistently developing his attack on the White King, in the final resort achieves perpetual check.
20 ...
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch!
$21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$
$21 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ is bad; $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 22$ K-Kt3, P-K4! But it was worth considering $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ (leaving the B file closed) though Black's three pawns for the piece made this continuation unconvincing.
21 K
K-B2

$$
\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \mathrm{ch}
$$

B-Kt2
$23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
If $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, 23 \ldots \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 24 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}(24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 27$ $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ), $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $25 \mathrm{~K}-$ $\mathrm{Kt3}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; and then too the game would probably have ended in a draw.
But now the threat $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ch
drives Black into the following combination, forcing a draw.
23 ...
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch!
$24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Agreeing to the draw, as the continuation $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1 \mathrm{ch}$; $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ !; followed by $27 \ldots$, Q-Q7 ch; or $27 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ ch led rather to Black's advantage. Or $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \mathrm{ch}$; $27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}!(28 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$; 31 BK 2 , in White's favour); $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $30 \quad \mathbf{B}-\mathrm{Kt2}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ with advantage to Black.

| $24 \ldots$ | QR-B1 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 | B-B3 |
| 26 K $\times$ R | R $\times$ B ch |
| 27 K-Kt2 | Q-K6 ch |
| 28 Kt $\times$ R | Q-Q ch |
| 29 K-Kt1 | Q-Q8 ch |
| 30 K-Kt2 | Q-Q7 ch |

## Drawn.

A brain-racking game.
No. 17. Queen's Gambit Declined - preliminary 8 ..., P-QR3 was also

| M. Botvinnik (White) | A. Batuyev (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | B-K2 |
| 5 P-K3 | O-O |
| 6 Kt -B3 | QKt-Q2 |
| 7 B-Q3 |  |

Here 7 R-B1 is more often played, but White is deliberately avoiding stereotyped variations.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
7 \ldots & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
8 \underset{\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}}{ } & \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B} 4
\end{array}
$$

This continuation, recommended by the chess primers, is apparently sufficient to equalize the game. The

## worth considering.

9 O-O
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$

After $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ a symmetrical pawn position is formed, and it is then not so difficult for Black to equalize the game. But now White has a certain preponderance in the centre, though, truly, at the cost of an isolated pawn.
$\begin{array}{lll}10 \ldots & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \\ 11 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 & \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Q} 4\end{array}$
Black wants to develop his QB to Kt2. Of course it is possible to play immediately $11 \ldots, B-Q 2$. With his next move White temporarily prevents $12 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$.
$12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

Here too $12 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is possible. But Black is aiming at exchanging off the White Queen's Bishop, in order to weaken White's Q4 pawn still more. It is difficult for White to avoid the exchange.

| $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Q-K2 |  |

Strong, too, is $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, exploiting the weak black squares.

| $14 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
| $16 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3!$ |  |

Black intends to transfer his Knight at K2 through Q4 to KB5 with pressure on the KtP. White forestalls this danger and simultaneously sets up a strong point for the Knight in the centre. In this game the Knight sacrifice met with in such positions $-17 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 18 \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ —proves unsound after $18 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K} 2)-\mathrm{Q} 4$. Now Black should have played $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K} 2)-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 18 \mathrm{Kt}-$ $\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $20 \mathrm{~B}-$ B 2 with approximately equal game. Instead he makes a decisive mistake.

| $17 \ldots$ | $R-B 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}!$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $19 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

No. 18. Queen's Indian Defence

|  | V. Chekhover <br> (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | (W-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| 2 | Kt-KB3 | P-QKt3 |
| 3 | P-KKt3 | B-Kt2 |
| 4 | B-Kt2 | P-Kt3 |

I should have given preference to $4 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 6 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} ; 7 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ with equal game.
5 O-O
B-Kt2

Forced, as now he cannot play $19 \ldots$ Kt(K2)-Q4; $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 22 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, and White wins.
$20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$
$21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
$\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B})-\mathrm{Q} 4$

There was a threat of $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} ; 24 \mathrm{Kt}-$ Q6 ch.

Position after Black's 17th move

$22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$
B-R1
23 R-K1!

Black is helpless against $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ followed by capture of the Knight at K2.

| 23 | $\ldots$ | P-Kt3 <br> 24 <br> $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ <br> 25 <br> $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ <br> Resigns |  |
|  |  |  |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |
| 7 | $\mathrm{QKt-Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

7 QKt-Q2
Bad. Now Black manages to open the KR1-QR8 diagonal and thus to hinder the development of the Bishop to QKt2; in addition, White has closed the B1-R6 diagonal to his Bishop. The right move is 7 Q-B2 (if at once $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, it is followed by Kt-K5!, Rabinovich-Ilyin-Zhenevsky, Leningrad, 1926) then Kt-B3, and P-K4 as occasion arises, and probably White would gain some advantage.

| 7 | $\ldots$ | P-B4! |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | P-Q5 | P-K3 |
| 9 | P-K4 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Here Blumenfeld's idea would not succeed: $9 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} t 4 ; 10 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! (11 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6!; 13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; and $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ), $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, B-Kt2; 16 Q-Q6.

## $10 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$

White apparently assumed that his position was quite satisfactory. That would be so if the Kt was at B3, not Q2. He should have played $10 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$; $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, not allowing Black Q -side pawn majority. But now Black gets an extra pawn on the Q side with the Bishop excellently posted at KKt2. White's preponderance in the centre is easily neutralized.

10 ...
P-Q3
1 R-K
To free the Knight from defence of the KP.
11 ...
R-K1
12 Kt -R4 Q-K2

An important move! White had intended to play $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, but, in view of the threat $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$, he is now forced to block the advance of his BP with the Knight.

## $13 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)-\mathrm{B} 3$ <br> QKt-Q2

Both now and later $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{KP} ; 14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ! would be only to White's advantage.

## 14 B-Q2 <br> P-QKt4

Black has completed his development and begins his advance on the Q side, where he has three pawns against two. Obviously, White's only counter-chance is an attack on the $\mathbf{K}$ side, as he is impotent on the $\mathbf{Q}$ side. White tries to put this plan into
effect, but with his next move he loses a tempo.
15 Q-B1
Q-B1

Attacking the KP.

| 16 Q-B2 | P-QR4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 P-KR3 | P-Kt5 |
| 18 Kt-R2 | B-QR3 |
| 19 P-B4 | Kt-R4! |

A little unpleasantness: it transpires that White cannot play either $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; or $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, B-Q5 ch!; 21 B-K3, Kt $\times$ BP. None the less salvation is found.
20 B-KB1! P-B5
Not $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP} ; 21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, R $\times$ B; 22 Q-Q3!

Now White is forced to defend with his King, as after the immediate 21 P-Kt4 comes $21 \ldots$, Kt-Kt6; $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 4!$; $23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-$ Kt6; 24 Q-Kt1, P-B6! then B-Q6 and $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$ ch.

| 21 K-Kt2 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{K})-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

Position after Black's 22nd move


Positionally Black's game is won; on the Q side he has gained a real advantage, while White is not yet prepared for attack on the K side. Already Black could strike a decisive blow with $22 \ldots$, P-Kt6! E.g. $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6 ; 24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $25 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q}) ; \quad 26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ and there can be no doubt as
to the result. But Black's position is so strong that he can afford to take his time.

| 23 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |  |

White hastens to exploit the breathing-space and to renew his attack on the King, interrupted by Black's operations on the Q side.

| $25 \ldots$ | Kt-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 P-B5 | Q-Q1 |

Position after Black's 26th move


The simplest! Other continuations also would win, probably.
27 P-B6
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$ !

Sacrificing the piece, Black transposes to a won endgame.

| $28 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $29 \mathrm{Kt}(4)-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |

This move has the defect that it blocks the Bishop at Kt7. So it would have been more exact to play first $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ and then $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$. The next six moves were made under acute time-trouble on both sides.

| $32 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

The immediate break-through 35 ..., P-Kt6; $36 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$;
$37 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{KB} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q}) ; 38 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$,
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; also leads to the win.

| $36 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $37 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |  |

The sealed move. Defeat follows 38 R-B2, P-Kt6!; $39 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R}(5) \times$ Kt ; $40 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7$; $41 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; then $42 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 8(\mathrm{Q})$ and Black has two extra pawns.

| $38 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $39 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 7!$ |

$.39 \ldots$, R-Q5; $40 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{R})-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ would lead to unnecessary complications.


If $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt} 7,46 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$; 47 K-B1 (47 K-B3, R-B6 ch; and $48 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}), \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ and win.

| 46 | P-Q7 | P-Kt6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 47 | R-Q8 |  |
| 48 | K-Kt3! |  |

An amusing little trap! Threatening $49 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ mate. After $48 \ldots$, R-Q6 ch; 49 R-B3, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 50 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ Black would have to play a prolonged endgame. But he has a no less interesting move at his own disposition.
48 ...
P-R3!
This immediately decides the game, as after $49 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 4$; 50 R R7, R-Q6 ch! (50 ..., B-Kt2 leads to a mate rarely met with: $51 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $52 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ mate); $51 \mathrm{~K}-$ $\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $53 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ White should lay down his arms.
49 R-B3
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
Resigns
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| No. 19. Queen's Gambit Declined |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| M. Botvinnik (White) | G. Kasparyan (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| 3 Kt -QB3 | Kt-KB3 |
| 4 Kt -B3 | QKt-Q2 |
| 5 B-B4 |  |

Only in order to avoid the stereotyped continuation. However, this move is not without purpose: it is more difficult for Black to simplify the game than after $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, or to carry out the Pillsbury attack (on QB3).
The variation $5 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $6 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 7 \mathrm{~KB} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 ; 9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is regarded as advantageous to White. In this game Black seeks new roads.
5 ...
B-Kt5
After all Black follows the Pillsbury system; but, after the correct reply $6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}!\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}(6 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 7 \mathrm{~B}-$ $\mathrm{Q} 2) ; 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ he would be unable to organize an attack on QB3. With his next move White cuts off his Bishop at KB4 from Q2 and makes it possible for Black to obtain a practically equal game.

| 6 P-K3 | O-O |
| :--- | :--- |
| 7 Q-Kt3 | P-B4 |
| 8 P-QR3 |  |

It is necessary to relieve the tension, otherwise $8 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ and Q-R4 could be very unpleasant.
8 ...
Q-R4
A faulty manœuvre, enabling White to obtain an advantageous endgame. The correct move is $8 \ldots$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch!; $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ (or $9 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; and $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch})$ maintaining the tension.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 9 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \\
& 10 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} \\
& \text { Unquestionably the strongest. } \\
& \text { After } 10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{Q}+3 \text { ! Black has } \\
& \text { the initiative on the } \mathrm{Q} \text { side. On the } \\
& \text { contrary, in the endgame which now } \\
& \text { follows White's game is to be pre- } \\
& \text { ferred, owing to the pair of Bishops } \\
& \text { and the strong central pawns. } \\
& \begin{array}{ll}
10 \ldots & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \text { ch } \\
11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt3} \\
12 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

After $12 \ldots, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ the Queen's Bishop has little scope. In addition, Black's only possibilities in the centre are by pressure with pieces.
$13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
There is nothing in $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{R}$ Q1; $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; and Black is excellently developed.
$13 \ldots$
B-Kt2
14 B-Kt5
Kt(4)-B3

Black is playing very cautiously. It is unsafe to play $14 \ldots, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q1}$; $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Kt}(4)-\mathrm{B} 3$; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! with advantageous complications.

| 15 | K-K2 | P-QR3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 B-Q3 | KR-QB1 |  |
| 17 | KR-Q1 |  |

17 KR-Q1
Negligence. The sound move is 17 P-B4 at once, safeguarding his QB3.
17 ...
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$
Exactly! A threat of 18
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, and $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$ ch, to avoid which White has to permit the exchange of his excellently posted Queen's Bishop.

## 18 P-B4 <br> B-B3

Why Black did not play $18 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, approximately equalizing the game, is incomprehensible. Now
his game gradually passes into a crisis. White saves his Bishop, and then squeezes the Black pieces out of their central positions, while methodically strengthening his own position.
19 B-B4
P-B3
20 P-KR4
P-R3
21 B-R2

An attempt to play $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, counting on $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ would here (and at preceding moves) be fruitless because of $22 \ldots$, B-Kt4!
$21 \ldots$
R-R2
$22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$
P-B4

A new weakening, forced, however, by the threat of losing the Knight.
$23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K} 5)-\mathrm{B} 3$
24 R-Q2
P-QKt4

For general positional reasons Black should have refrained from this break-through, as it is well known that in open positions two Bishops are particularly strong.

| 25 | $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ |

The only way to defend the K3 pawn.

## 28 R(Q)-B2 R-K1

$A$ shrewd defence against the threat of $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, winning a pawn. Now $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; 30
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch is followed by $30 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ ! and Black wins.
$29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$
This loses immediately. However, it is doubtful whether any other continuation, e.g. 29 ..., B-R5 would save Black.
Position after Black's 29th move


30 B-QR2!
This cunning move escaped Black's notice. His Bishop cannot retreat, as then $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ! and Black is paralysed.

| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $32 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{R})-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $34 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $35 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Resigns |

Despite the early exchange of Queens the game was of a fighting nature to the end.
U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP

October

| No. 20. Queen's Gambit Declined |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| M. Botvinnik (White) | N. Sorokin (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-KB3 |
| 3 P-B4 | P-K3 |
| 4 Kt -B3 | QKt-Q2 |


| 5 B-Kt5 | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 P-K3 | O-O |
| 7 B-Q3 | P-B3 |

Strictly speaking, this move is unsound. It should be made only after White has played R-QB1.

Theory recommends $7 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $8 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ with approximately
equal game. After Black has himself played P-B3 White of course does not develop the Rook, but Castles, which in the given position is much more useful.

$$
8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3
$$

It is possible that Black intended later to play $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} 4$, but most probably he was planning the variation $9 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$; $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$. However, White's next move puts difficulties in the way of both these possibilities.

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4 & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \\
10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4
\end{array}
$$

The cause of all Black's later difficulties. The move is bad for the following reasons: after the exchange Black must recapture the pawn with a developed piece, so losing time; in addition, White will succeed in occupying the Q file. The superiority in White's development will be still further increased because Black on the one hand must try to get rid of the unpleasant Bishop at Kt5, and on the other hand must hinder the moves P-K4-K5. Here $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ is better.

$$
11 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Perhaps $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ is a little better.

| 12 Q-K2 | P-R3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 B-R4 | B-K2 |
| 14 KR-Q1 | Kt-R4 |

Thus Black obtains an exchange of Bishops; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is now not so dangerous for him, if only because of $15 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, Q-K2; $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 18 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, B $\times$ P ch.
$15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$Q \times B$
$16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

Now it is clear that Black has not succeeded in preventing White from realizing his plan.
$16 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

17 QR-Q1 Q-B4
$17 \ldots$, B-Q2 might have been followed by $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 19$ P-R5, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{KB} 3) \times$ R ; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ or 22 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. Meanwhile White threatened 18 R-Q6, which would have followed also $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
Also weaker is $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, because of the simple $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.
18 B-R2
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
19 P-K4 P-K4

Black could not allow P-K5. Now by way of B-Kt5 or B-K3 he prepares to solve the urgent problem of developing his Queen's Bishop.

Position after Black's 19th move


## 20 Q-K3!

This far from obvious move is the strongest in the given position. With the exchange of Queens, which he cannot avoid, the defects of Black's position grow more perceptible. In view of the backwardness of his development Black now certainly cannot oppose anything to the pressure along the $Q$ file. His KP becomes very weak. To defend it Black finds himself forced to exchange a Bishop for the Knight at B3, after which not only his Q side but square KB 2 is weakened.
The doubling of white pawns on the K file is of no essential importance.

| $20 \ldots$ | $Q \times Q$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| $22 \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |

It is doubtful whether $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt} 3)-\mathrm{Q} 2$ would be better. It could be followed by $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ (24 ..., R(B)-Q1; $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ !) ; $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $27 \mathrm{Kt}-$ R4! and $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ with an excellent game.

## 23 R-QB1

Renewing the attack on the KP.
23 ...
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Sad though it be, the exchange is necessary. After $23 \ldots$, R-K1 White could play 24 P-R3, B-R4 (24 ..., $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3 ; 25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ ch); $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ! and the threat $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ is very unpleasant.
$24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
$25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
White provokes a further exchange, finally establishing his advantage. If now $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B}) \times \mathrm{Kt}$; counting on $26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, it is simplest of all for White to reply: $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and if $26 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, he has a won Rook endgame.
Black's next move is fatal to him owing to the weakness of his KB2.

| $25 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |

Or at once $27 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; 28 R(B)-B7. Black still defend KB2.

## 28 K-B2!

After this Black must admit that he cannot save the KB2 pawn, as there is no defence against the threat $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt1}$ ch and $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$.


Black allows his Knight to be stultified; but after $32 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $33 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ he loses more pawns. $32 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ is followed simply by 33 R-B7.
33 P-Kt3 R-Q1
$34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
Another possibility is $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$, R-Q3; $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, Kt-B3; $36 \mathrm{~K}-$ Kt4. But White does not want the Black Knight to come into play.

| 34 | P-B4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $36 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | R-Q3 |
| $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | R-KB3 |
| $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | R-Q3 |
| 39 P-R4 | R-QKt3 |
| $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | R-KB3 |
| 41 R-R7 | R-Kt3 |
| $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ | R-Q3 |
| 43 R -QB7 | R-KB3 |
| 44 R-R7 | R--Kt3 |

Of course, White's repetition was in order to gain time for consideration. Now he puts his plan into effect.

| 45 R-QB7 | R-KB3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 46 K-R5 | R-Q3 |

Position after Black's 46th move


47 B-B7!
R-KB3
Not $47 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ because of $48 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4!}$ and the unlucky Knight is lost! The Bishop is transferred to Kt6, after which the King is caught in the net.

| 48 B-Kt6 $\quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $50 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-Kt1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $49 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ ( R-B1 | $51 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7}$ ch | K-R1 |
| Loses at once. The "normal" | $52 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | $\mathbf{R} \times$ B |
| course of events would be 49 | $53 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | K-Kt1 |
| K-Kt1; $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 55$, R-B8; $51 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ ! | $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | Kt-Q7 |
| and Black is helpless against the | $55 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | Resigns |

No. 21. King's Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik (White) | V. Alatortsev (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-KKt3 |
| 3 P-B3 | B-Kt2 |

To-day no one is afraid of $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, as it is known that the variation $3 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4!$; $4 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ leads to an equal game, owing to the weakness of the White QP. But when this game was played 3 P-B3 was a menacing weapon.

| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |

To-day everybody knows that here it is sound for White to play $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, as recommended by V. Makogonov. After $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ Black can continue best of all as Pirc played in a game with Euwe (Hastings, 1938/39). 7 $\ldots, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ !; $8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; and the threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ gives Black coun-ter-play. Black's text move leads to a difficult game for him.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
7 \ldots & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 \\
8 \underset{\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2}{ } & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2
\end{array}
$$

Black has in mind after $9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ to continue $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; 10 P QKt3, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ ! with the initiative. So White closes up the centre, intending to organize an attack on the Black King.

$$
9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2
$$

$9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ is preferable, to transfer the Knight to QB4.

## 10 P-KKt3!

For a pawn attack it would of course be more convenient to advance the $K K t$ pawn two squares; but then after 10 ..., $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! (threatening the unpleasant P-B5) Black would force an exchange at KB4, and his pieces would be freed.
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is not dangerous in itself. For White it is important only to hinder the further advance of the KBP and not himself to exchange at B4. If he succeeds in maintaining the existing pawn formation, which greatly cramps Black's pieces, his superiority will be unquestionable. The text move meets all these requirements.
10 ...
P-KB4
11 B-Kt2
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

Black still does not realize that his pieces are almost in zugszwang. This exchange is entirely in White's favour as it at once clears up the position in the centre. Having the worse position, Black should have aimed at complicating the struggle, by continuing $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$.
$12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Kt-KB3
13 P-KR3

To prevent Kt-Kt5. $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$ R4 would be met simply by 14 P-Kt4.

| 13 | $\ldots$ | P-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | P-Kt3 | K-R1 |
| 15 | P-KKt4! |  |

The signal for attack! White should not be in a hurry to Castle, as it would provoke Black's counterattack on the $\mathbf{Q}$ side. But if Black
begins operations on the Q side before White Castles long, White is able to change his plan, to Castle short and exploit Black's weakness on the Q side.
The manœuvre Black has undertaken (K-R1, Kt-Ktl) does not do much to strengthen the K side. On the contrary, on the R file the King is more in danger than on the Kt file; however, Black aimed to control his KR3.

| $15 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K} 2)-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $17 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ |

Position after Black's 17th move


It was now, when White had Castled, that Black's operations should have begun on the Q side. True, White's attack, (Q-K2, P-Kt5 and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4-\mathrm{R} 5$ ) would develop much faster, but even so the refusal to counter-attack greatly simplifies White's task.

## No. 22. Dutch Defence

| M. Botvinnik | I. Kann |
| :---: | ---: |
| (White) | (Black) |
| 1 P-Q4 | P-K3 |

If Black wishes to play the Dutch Defence, this move is almost obligatory. If he plays immediately 1 ..., P-KB4 White has the dangerous Staunton gambit at his disposal:

## 18 P-Kt5 <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

The continuation $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $19 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ surrenders a paiwn, but it defends the King most reliably of all.

## 19 P-KR4

The simple $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KKtP}$ is also playable.

## 19 ... <br> B-Kt5

Loses at once. He should have displayed sangfroid and decided on 19 ..., P-Kt5; 20 P-R5, K-R2; relying on the pawn at Kt5 to hold up White's attack for a time. But even in this case it is doubtful whether Black could have held out for long; e.g. $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; 22 QR-KB1.
$20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ dis. ch $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$
$21 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3)-\mathrm{K} 2$
Preventing any propitiatory sacrifices on the lines of R-KB5.

| $21 \cdots$ | Kt-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | Q-Q2 |
| $23 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |

$24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$
The simplest.

| 24 | $\ldots$ | Q $\times$ R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | B-R3 | Q-B6 |
| 26 | R-B1 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 27 | B-K6 ch |  |

Black resigns, as after $27 \ldots$... $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1 ; 28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 29 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, there is no defence against 30 Q R2 ch.
$2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, Kt$\mathrm{KB} 3 ; 4 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$; $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ !, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 6 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3 ; 7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ ! with White excellently developed and having a good attack in exchange for a pawn.

| 2 | P-QB4 | P-KB4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | P-KKt3 | Kt-KB3 |
| 4 | B-Kt2 | B-K2 |

Theory also recommends $4 \ldots$,

B-Kt5 ch, exchanging the Bishop and preparing the later move $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.

The continuation Black has chosen is usually associated with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. In this game Black played $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, following the example of IlyinZhenevsky, who had applied this defence with some success.

| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |  |

This is the move usually chosen by Ilyin-Zhenevsky's opponents, the object being to prevent Black's P-K4. However, they usually develop the Bishop at QKt2, not R3, as in the present game. Developing the Bishop at R3 must be regarded as superior, as then White not only renders $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ difficult, but also develops the QKt not at Q2, but at QB3, where it is more active.

$$
7 \ldots \quad \text { Q-K1 }
$$

The Queen posted at K1, characteristic of the Dutch Defence, was an indispensable link in Ilyin-Zhenevsky's system. The Bishop for defence of the B 2 pawn can retreat to Q 1 , leaving the Queen the possibility from K1 of taking part in preparation for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.

$$
8 \text { Q-B2 } \quad \text { Q-R4 }
$$

Also possible is $8 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; 9 B-QR3, Kt-B3; $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 13 QR-Q1, but in this variation Black's defence of the QKt pawn is rendered difficult. At first glance Black by the text move renounces the basic idea of advancing his central pawn, but in reality this is not so; Black's plan includes $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, B-Q2, QR-K1, B-Q1, and P-K4.

| $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Here Black should have played
10 . . ., P-R4! preparing Kt-Kt5. At
this time this manœuvre was not thought of.

It may seem strange that White so obstinately refuses to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. For it is known that a successful opening up of the centre by way of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ always gives White a tangible advantage in the Dutch Defence. That is unsound only when White's Queen's Bishop is at R3, for there it is undefended. E.g. $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 13 \mathrm{Q} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! and White loses a piece.
However, there is no necessity for White to try for P-K4; he has other no less powerful possibilities at his command.
$11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ !
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1$

The Knight has to retreat, for $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ loses a piece.

## $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$

Attracted by the superiority of two Bishops over Bishop and Knight, White allows his opponent a breath-ing-space. He should have continued $12 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, increasing the pressure.

## $12 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ <br> $12 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is a quite joyless

 outlook.$\begin{array}{ll}13 \\ 14 & \text { B } \times \text { B }\end{array}$
Nothing better presents itself. If $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q}), \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; Black has a stronger attack in exchange for the pawn, while if $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (or even $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3) ; 15 \mathrm{~B} \times$ QP, B-B3; 16 P-B3, P-K5 Black approximately equalizes the game.
$14 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Opening the diagonal for the Bishop.
$15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ !
Excellently played! A threat of

16 ..., B-R6 and then Kt-Kt5. So White sets up counter-chances on the Q file.
The QBP is indirectly defended, as if $16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$; $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ !

$$
16 \text { QR-Q1 } \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}
$$

After this White again succeeds in seizing the initiative. $16 \ldots$, B-R6 is stronger, with, e.g. the continuation $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $18 \mathrm{~B}-$ B3, Q-B2 (otherwise $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 7$ ); 19 R(B)-K1.
$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
B-K3
18 Q-Q3

It appears that Black underestimated this move. Now he is forced to renounce the transfer $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ which has been his objective.

18 Q-K4 is weaker for White, as it leads to $18 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and a forced exchange on K6.

$$
18 \ldots \quad B \times B
$$

19 B-B3 could have been unpleasant.

## $19 \mathbf{Q} \times$ B

Of course, not $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, because of ..., R-B3!, with its continuation ., Kt-B2-Kt4 or $20 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$. White prefers to continue play along the Q file, which is greatly strengthened by his Bishop, controlling KB8. 19 ...

Kt-B3
Position after Black's 19th move


## 20 B-B5!

The most difficult moment of the game. The Bishop move seems very simple, yet it was not easy to find.

If immediately $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4,20 \ldots$, $R-Q 1$ is playable, as the pawn has blocked the Bishop's diagonal. 20 Q-K6 is refuted by $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$.
But now White threatens both 21 QK6 and $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$. And in the event of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ White gets the better endgame.

| 20 | P-QKt4 | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | P-QR3 |  |

Allowing an interesting finish. Correct is $21 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$; 22 P Kt5, Kt-Q1 (22 ..., R-Q1; 23 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}!$ ) and a long struggle still ahead.

| 22 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| Q-K 6 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |

Immediately decides the game.

| 24 | $\ldots$ | R-R1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | R-Q7 | Q-Kt3 |
| 26 | Q-Q5 | P-R3 |
| 27 | R $\times$ P | R-K1 |
| 28 | B-Kt4 |  |

Transposing to an easily won endgame.

| 28 | P-Kt3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times$ B |
| $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | Q-K3 |
| $31 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $32 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | R-K1 |
| $33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ | R-QKt1 |
| $35 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | K-K3 |
| $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | P-Kt4 |
| 38 K-K4 | Resigns |

No. 23. Queen's Gambit Declined

## V. Rauzer <br> (White)

| 1 | P-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-K3 |
| 3 | Kt-QB3 | P-Q4 |
| 4 | B-Kt5 | QKt-Q2 |
| 5 | Kt-B3 | P-B3 |

6 Q-Kt3
M. Botvinnik
(Black)
1 P-Q4
P-K3
P-Q4
QKt-Q2
P-B3

This system, beginning with 6 QKt 3 , was invented and thoroughly analysed by the Master V. Rauzer. The idea of the text move (not of the entire system, of course) is not original: White avoids the Cambridge Springs Variation, as $6 \ldots$, Q-R4 is followed by 7 B-Q2! In the 1920s several games with Rochlin's move $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ were published in Soviet periodicals, the idea being analogous to that of Rauzer's move. As is known, finally the analysts managed to refute the Rochlin variation, chiefly because White's BP cannot be defended. 6 Q-Kt3 is free from this very essential defect. So Black is compelled to renounce the Cambridge Springs variation and resort to orthodox defence.

| 6 |  | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 P-K3 | O-O |  |
| 8 B-K2 |  |  |

After move six White's plan for further play was still not clear, but now his intention is gradually being disclosed: White refrains from the usual B-Q3 as he proposes to develop pressure on the Q file. At first glance this seems impossible, as the Q file is closed with pawns; but with more thoughtful consideration of the position it is impossible not to admit that his plan is justified. E.g. if we assume that White's Knight at B3 reaches K5, exchanges on this square will be disadvantageous to Black, as they
will partially open the $\mathbf{Q}$ file. Meanwhile Black still has difficulty in developing his Queen's Bishop. It is interesting to note that in those games of the U.S.S.R. 1931 Championship in which Rauzer played 6 Q-Kt3, he always had the better game. Black's following attempt to develop the Queen's Bishop may be recommended as the best.
$8 \ldots$
P-QKt3
$9 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
Later it will become apparent that the immediate exchange at Q 5 was not provoked by necessity. In general to relieve the pawn tension in the centre (in reply to Black's PQKt3) is good only if the $Q$ side can be weakened with B-R6, or if Black threatens to free his game by capturing at his QB5. After the text move Black has a half-open $K$ file.
9 ...
$K \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

## 10 O-O

Obviously, White cannot exchange off the white-square Bishops, as after 10 Q-R4, B-Kt2; 11 B-R6, P-Kt4 he loses a piece.
10 ...
B-Kt2
11 KR-Q1

Stereotyped! As already pointed out, White's plan included developing the Knight to K5. In that case, with the continuation $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$, the Rook would be very useful on the KB file. So the correct move here is 11 QR-Q1.
$11 \ldots \quad$ QR-B1
A very serious error! Analysing this position at home, I proposed to continue $11 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ (necessary, as the immediate $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is met by $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ); $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ with an equal game. But at the board I departed from this intention, not wishing to
simplify the position, and at once miscalculated. $11 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ! is very strong, preventing $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, because of $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 13 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1!$ winning the KP. But now White continues $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ with advantage.

## $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Black is forced to exchange Knights immediately, as after 13 P-KB4 White would recapture at K5 with the BP.
$13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
$14 \mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{B} 4$ !
Excellent! White has no need whatever to exchange Bishops: he is already threatening $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, against which Black must take urgent measures. E.g. unsatisfactory is 14 ..., P-KB3; $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ ! and the threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is irresistible.

From the combinative aspect Black's next move is hardly quite correct, and it was made partly because of general positional considerations. Black assumed that after the exchange of Bishops the pawn trio K5, B4, K3 would prove inadequately defended.

## 14 ... B-Kt4

Provoking White into active operations in the centre and having in mind an interesting Queen manœuvre (see note after Black's 18th move) which at first glance refutes White's attack.

## $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$

Unquestionably sound. The Knight's "brilliant" leap $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, after $15 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, K-R1 would lead to Black's advantage.
15 ...
Q $\times$ B
17 P-K4!

Position after White's 17 th move

$17 \ldots$
Q-B4 ch
Inadequately thought out! White's 17th move was no surprise to Black. Seeing it several moves ahead, when he called check Black was confident that this led to a win. What he counted on can be seen from the note to the next move. The right continuation, sufficient to equalize play, is $17 \ldots$, Kt-B4!; 18 Q-R3, KR-Q1; 19 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 21$ $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1!$; $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ !; 23 Q-B7, R-Q2; 24 Q-Kt8 ch, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; and a draw by repetition of moves.

18 K-R1 R(QB)-Q1
Only here did I notice that the Queen manœuvre thought of at the 14th move: $18 \ldots$, Q-K6 (threatening $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ and $19 \ldots \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ) would not work because of the unpleasant, though fairly obvious surprise: $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ QP! and White wins easily. I had to seek a continuation which would allow me still "to fish in troubled waters." After $18 \ldots$... P-Q5; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-QB4; 21 R-B4 (or 21 R-Q6) Black would hardly have any hope of salvation.
$19 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
Q-K6

Completely bad is $19 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! ( $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ !) and

White wins a pawn with an easy position.

## 20 Q-B4

Presumably reckoning that after winning the pawn the rest was only a "question of technique," White at that moment revealed his ignorance of the technique of exploiting his superiority. There was an easy win in $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! (not clinging to the $\mathrm{KBP}), \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} ; 21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 22 Q-R3, B-B1; $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, etc. After the text move Black can count on the draw as almost secured.
20 ...
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
A second mistake. White does not realize the danger of his position. He should have played 21 Q-Q4, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 22 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and White would even have rather the better endgame.
$22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !

Position after White's 22nd move


The Knight is achieving brilliant successes! After 23 ..., Kt-K5 White faces the very unpleasant threat of a smothered mate. If 23 QR-Q1 Black all the same plays $23 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! winning the exchange. At the moment Black is threatening to win a piece: $23 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 24
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$. As $23 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ is obviously unsatisfactory, White's next move is forced.

## 23 B-B3

Kt-Q6
White has saved his piece, but has not defended himself against the Knight invasion.

## 24 P-KR3

Again the only move.
$24 \ldots$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$
$25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$

If White takes the Rook with his Queen then, by way of $25 \ldots$, Kt-B7 ch; $26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}$; 27 P-Kt3, Q-K6 and $28 \ldots$ Kt-Q6 Black secures for himself a sure but technically difficult win.
25 ...
Q-Kt6

R-KB1
It is this natural move alone that proves to be the decisive mistake. A few years after this game was played, one amateur found salvation for White in $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch!! (This combinative blow needed to be made at once. Rauzer decided on it too late.) $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ !, Kt-B7 ch; 28 K-Kt1, Kt $\times$ P ch; 29 K-R1, and a draw by perpetual check, as after $29 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 7$ ch Black is mated.
$26 \ldots$
Kt-B7 ch
27 K-Kt1

Needless to say, immediate 27 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is no salvation.
27 K
28 K-R1

$$
\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}
$$

$29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

If $29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$, Black would win by a simple method: $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ !; 30 R-B3 ( $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch} ; 31$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ ), Q-K8 ch; $31 \mathrm{Q}-$ B1 (31 R-B1, Q-K6 ch; $32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 6), \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{ch} ; 32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}(32$ $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}), \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ ! and White loses the exchange.

| $29 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \underset{\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{P} \text { ch }}{ }$ |  |
| Too late! |  |
| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! |

No. 24. Slav Defence

| M. Botvinnik (White) | N. Riumin (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-QB3 |
| 3 Kt -KB3 | Kt-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-K3 |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

As I have already said in my notes to Game 8, against Sozin, at this period I avoided the Meran Variation and so did not play $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

QKt-Q2
$6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
Here $6 \mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is more consistent, in order to recapture with the Knight after $6 \ldots, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$, and White prevents P-K4 for a long time. But White was not attracted by the Semmering variation, $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, $\mathrm{P}-$ B4! which almost entirely equalizes the game for Black. As will be seen later, the text move also yields White no advantage, if Black chooses a sound plan.
6 ... B-Q3
An oldfashioned manner of playing this defence. In our day theory recommends B-K2.
The idea of achieving freedom by advancing the KP is sound, but tactically it should have been carried through differently. It was necessary to play $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}!$; $7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, and White is unable to prevent Black's liberating move P-K4-as in the 23rd game of the first match between Alekhine and Bogoljubov.

## 7 QKt-Q2

A highly important move! White

To reply to $32 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 7$ dis. ch with $32 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $33 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch}$, Q-B1; 34 Q-K6 ch, Q-B2; and the Rook at B5 defends B1.

White resigns.
parries Black's threat, indicated in the preceding note ( $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ). Now we have the Semmering Variation, with the difference that Black has played $B-Q 3$ instead of the sound move P-B4.
Black should now have summed up the situation and given up the struggle for the centre, playing $7 \ldots$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} ; 8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, emerging with a cramped but strong position.

$$
7 \ldots \quad \text { P-K4 }
$$

One cannot assume that Black was unaware of the theoretical arguments against this highly dubious sally; it is obvious that the play opens up to White's advantage. One can assume with confidence that, playing to win in this game, Black deliberately went for complications. But in doing so he committed a double error. First, when facing an opponent who has a fairly good knowledge of opening variations, one must not choose unsatisfactory continuations. Secondly, the game must be complicated in such a manner that it is not associated with any risk of getting a lost position. In this regard many of Alekhine's games are highly instructive, for he had a masterly way of finding the road to complications at the right moment.

## 8 P-K4! O-O

Necessary. Neither $8 \ldots, K \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, nor $8 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP} ; 9 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ BP , nor, finally, $8 \ldots, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{KP}$; $9 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2) \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} ; 11 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$ ch ensured equality.
$9 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ $10 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! leads to the loss of a pawn.

Position after Black's 10th move


A very interesting position has arisen, completely symmetrical, with the $\mathbf{Q}$ file queerly cluttered up with pieces. In such cases the advantage most often remains with the one whose turn it is to move. The present position excellently illustrates this rule. White's idea is very simple: to defend the pawn on Q5, and to win the pawn on Q4.

## $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ <br> $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Black agrees to give up his Q5 pawn without a struggle; however, it is difficult to advise anything better. After $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B4 (or $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ ); $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 13 B-KKt5, or $11 \ldots \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ (continuing the symmetry); $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KKt5}$, B-KKt5; 13 B-K2! Black's position is unsatisfactory. $11 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$; 12 P-Q6 also looks doubtful.

## $12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ <br> $$
\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4
$$

Again a perfectly sound idea (in exchange for a pawn Black tries to get the advantage of the pair of Bishops), but tactically it is so inexact that the two-Bishop superiority turns out to be not Black's, but White's!

Stronger is $12 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! forcing the continuation: $13 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ (13 B-Kt5, B-K2!; $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} ; 15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3!), \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$ (13 ..., R-K1; 14 B-Kt5!, B-K2; $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ !); $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, which will be referred to in the next note.

## 13 B-B2

$13 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ immediately is also possible, but after $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$; $15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, BKB4; or 15 Q-Q3, Q-B3! Black would have excellent compensation for his pawn in the shape of two Bishops. So White accepts the doubling of his pawns on the $K$ side, simply so that he may himself be left with two Bishops. True, even now, by continuing $13 \ldots$. P-Q6; $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{K t}$, Black would get two Bishops. But in doing so he would of course lose a tempo by comparison with the analogous continuation he could have forced earlier.

| $13 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14 \underset{\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}}{ }$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $15 \mathrm{P} \times$ B | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1!$ |

Subtly played! After the more superficial $15 \ldots$, Q-Q2, with 16 Q-KR4 White, having secured his King, would himself have the attack against the Black King. Similarly $15 \ldots$, P-B4; $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ promised Black unpleasantness.
The text move has the wily threat of $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$, as after $17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ Black has his choice between a draw, by $17 \ldots$, Q-R5; 18 P-B4, Q-Kt5 ch , or winning back a piece by 17 $\ldots$, QR-B1. White finds the right continuation, consolidating his material superiority.
16 R-Q1! R-K7
It is obvious that after $16 \ldots$, B-K4 then 17 Q-KKt4.

| 17 B-B5 | P-KKt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 B-R3 | Kt-Q2! |

Black is manœuvring with great artistry. He threatens $19 \ldots$, B-B4 and $19 \ldots$, B-K4 with attack on one of the pawns. However, if the position is studied carefully it is easy to see that Black's initiative is of a temporary nature. White has only to return his opponent his pawn for Black's attack to dissipate, and with his two Bishops and the passed pawn at Q5 White will be able to decide the game swiftly in his own favour. But it is not even necessary to return the pawn; 19 Q-Q3, R-K1; 20 PB4! is quite sufficient for a win.
The first method, which White chooses, should yield fruit more quickly.
19 B-K3!
B-K4
20 Q-QB4
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
21 QR-B1

This move may not let the win slip, but it greatly complicates it. The logical continuation was 21 P Q6! (exploiting the circumstance that in order to win the KtP Black has had to raise his blockade of the QP) and Black has no satisfactory defence. E.g. 21 P-Q6, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{Q})$; 23 Q-Q4! or 21 P-Q6, R-B1; 22 Q-K4, B-B3 (22 ..., B-Kt2; 23 Q-K7); 23 Q-Kt4! Black could not struggle for long against the Q6 pawn.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

White's mistake is replied to with one by Black. It has long been known that the Queen is a bad intermediary, as any piece can drive

No. 25. English Opening

|  | G. Kirillov  <br>   <br>  (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | P-QB4 | P-QB4 |
| 2 | Kt-QB3 | Kt-KB3 |
| 3 | P-KKt3 |  |

her off. The correct move is $22 \ldots$, B-Q3, after which White would have the slightly better position, but no forced win. Now the game is decided in a few moves.

Position after Black's 22nd move


## 23 P-B4

B-Kt2
After 23 ..., B-B3; 24 B-QB5, Q-Q1; 25 P-Q6 also, Black would soon be forced to lay down his arms. 24 B-QB5
White's pieces dominate the whole board. The rest is simple.

| $24 \ldots$ | Q-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 7$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 44$ |
| $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $28 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ |
| 29 Q | Q 3 |
| $30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 8$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{RR}$ |
| 32 |  |
| R-Q8 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

Here the time check ended, and Black resigned without waiting for White's reply.

Experience has shown that this system gives White no advantage whatever, if Black succeeds in exchanging off pawns in the centre and then posting his Knight at QB2, where it occupies a useful position.
3 .
...
P-Q4
$4 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$K t \times P$

5 B-Kt2
After this Black prevents P-Q4, and White proves unable to set up a pawn centre. But even his piece development is not altogether satisfactory. His King's Bishop can do nothing alone, and if the Queen's Bishop is developed at QKt2 it will come up against the pawn outpost at K4. Here the best move is 5 P-Q4! which leads to a quite satisfactory game for White.
$5 \ldots$
Kt-B2
Often played by A. Rubinstein and, apparently, stronger than $5 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, as at B 2 the Knight does not block the KtP, which may be needed to defend B4.

| $6 \mathrm{Kt-B3}$ | $\mathrm{Kt-B3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

With colours reversed we now have the "dragon" variation of the Sicilian Defence, and that in a form advantageous to Black, as the QBP is already posted at B4. For the next few moves the opponents' respective plans are fairly clear. White is organizing an attack on the QBP, while Black is aiming at rapid development and consolidation of the central outposts, B4 and K4.

| 8 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |

White is now threatening Kt-QR4, with simultaneous attack on the pawns at B4 and K4. He has outstripped Black in development and holds the initiative. The only question is whether he will be able with an attack on B4 to achieve real advantages; if this attack is repulsed his initiative will be ended, and Black's superiority in the centre will tell at once.

| $10 \ldots$ | $P-K B 3$ | $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | Q-B2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |  | $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | P-QKt3 |

Necessary! If at once $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$; $11 \ldots$, P-QKt3! and the continuation $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$ is clearly bad for White. Black could now play $11 \ldots$, B-Q2, in order if $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ to continue none the less $12 \ldots$, P-QKt3. But, assuming that the pawn at B4 can be defended by other more energetic moves, Black first prevents $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.

| $11 \ldots$ | B-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | Kt-R3 |
| $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | Q-R4 |
| $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

White cannot further increase the pressure on the B4 pawn. Meanwhile Black has only to bring his Rooks into action to complete his development. The exchange $14 \mathrm{~B} \times$ Kt would give Black doubled pawns, but with his two strong Bishops he would be able to develop operations on the weakened K side.

| $14 \ldots$ | KR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

Not $15 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16$ Q-K1, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (depriving the Black Queen of defence), $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$; 18 R-Q1, QR-Q1; 19 B-B1, and White wins.

## 16 P-Q3

An admission of the bankruptcy of his plan associated with attack on the BP. Meanwhile Black, now developing his last piece, disposes of the threat $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and passes to a decisive attack.
Black's greatest difficulties would arise from $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, though in this case, by continuing $17 \ldots$, QR-B1; 18 Q-B2, Kt-Kt5 he retains superiority.

| $16 \ldots$ | QR-B1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | Q-B2 |
| $18 \mathrm{Kt-Q} 2$ | P-QKt3 |
| $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |

White is at a loss and is playing without plan.

| $19 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5!$ |

Position after Black's $21 \ldots$ Kt-Kt5


Black has achieved an ideal disposition of his pieces and pawns. His Knights are posted invulnerably, as the moves $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ would fatally weaken White's position.

Now White fails to see a fairly obvious combination, by which

Black wins a pawn. But in any case it is hardly possible now to indicate any way to his salvation.

| $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times R P!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $23 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{KB} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |$\quad$

$23 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{QB} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 26 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ is also hopeless for White.

| $23 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QKt5}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |  |

$30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$
No better is $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6$; 33 Q-B4 ch, K-R1; $34 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; and $35 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch with easy win.

| $30 \ldots$ | P-QR4 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 R-R4 | Q-B6 |  |
| 32 R-R4 | Q-B8 |  |
|  | Resigns |  |

## NINETEEN THIRTY-TWO

So far as chess was concerned, 1932 was a comparatively uneventful year for me; I played only eleven games, in the Leningrad Championship. A year had passed since the U.S.S.R. Seventh Championship, but the lack of training did not affect my results: I had two draws, and won all the rest. Five of the games are given in this book (Nos. 26-30). In all probability my lack of training was offset by the amount of work I did in preparing my book on the games of the Seventh Championship (this was my first important work on chess), so that I was adequately trained in analysis.

I spent my summer holiday in the Mordovian Region, on the banks of the river Moksha, in the ancient town of Temnikov, which was nearly forty miles from the railway. There I successfully analysed all the U.S.S.R. championship games, and returned to Leningrad fully equipped.

In the spring of 1931 I passed out of the Institute, as a fully qualified electrical engineer, but stayed on as a post-graduate student.

## LENINGRAD CHAMPIONSHIP

September
No. 26. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik (White) | G. Myasoyedov (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt5 |
| 4 Q-Kt3 | P-B4 |
| $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-B3 |
| 6 B-Kt5 |  |

I played this move in a game with Mazel, in the U.S.S.R. 1931 Championship. White aims at preventing $6 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, which gives Black an equal game. In the game with Mazel $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ was replied to by $6 \ldots$, $B \times P$ and White retained superiority. Myasoyedov chooses a different way of development, which also does not enable Black to equalize the game. 6 ...

Q-R4
The defect of this move is that after $7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ Black is left with a shattered pawn position. Ragozin found the right reply to $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ in a game against me (Tournament of the Leningrad House of Scientists, 1932-33) which went: $6 \ldots, P_{-}$ KR3; 7 B-R4, P-Kt4; 8 B-Kt3, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 ; \quad 9 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 10$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! and Black has excellent play.

| $7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Kt-B3 |

$8 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ was worth considering. 9 P-QR3

B-R4
Black withdraws his Bishop to a less effective diagonal. Preferable is $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; 10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$; followed by P-Q3 and B-Q2.
10 P-K3
P-QR3
11 B-K2
KR-Kt1

Black lets slip the opportunity 11 ..., P-Q4!; 12 R-QB1 (12 P $\times$ P,
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch; $13 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q P}), \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ which would have freed his game a little. This shows that White too had played inexactly on the preceding move: instead of $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ he should have played $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ ! with a sharp struggle.
12 O-O B-B2

Probably $12 \ldots, \quad$ P-B4 is stronger, preventing $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$.

## $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ <br> Q-K2

None the less the better move is $13 \ldots$..., Q-B4; 14 Q-Q3! (to reply to $14 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ with $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}), \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$, etc. But now the tempo of events is quickened.

## 14 Q-B3 <br> R-Kt3

Position after Black's 14th move

$14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! is no better, since Black cannot defend himself against $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$. 15 P-B5!

A murderous move! Threatening QR-Q1 and Kt-Q6 ch. Not $15 \ldots$, P-B4; 16 Q-R8 ch, Q-B1; 17 Kt -B6 ch, winning a pawn. If $15 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt3}$; $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 17 KR-Q1, B-B2; then 18 QR-B1, and Black has no move. His following attempt to free himself is also not very satisfactory.

## NINETEEN THIRTY-TWO

| $15 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{P} \times$ P e.p. | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $17 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

As defence against $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{RP}$, which now would be met by $19 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ and Black wins.

## 19 QR-B1

Again threatening $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{RP}$.

| $19 \ldots$ | B-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \underset{\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}}{ }$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

$20 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is hopeless.
21 P-B4
21 Q-R5, Kt-B3; 22 Q-Kt6 was also worth considering; Black would have great difficulty in meeting the threat of $23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$.

| $21 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

No. 27. French Defence

| I. Rabinovich (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt5 |
| $4 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

With this continuation Black experiences no difficulty whatever in development; so it is rarely played in tournaments.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |

A very dubious manœuvre. Better to play at once $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$.

| $9 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

More consistent would be $10 \ldots$,

## 23 P-QKt4 <br> Kt-Q1

Leads to immediate defeat. Black could have resisted a little longer with $23 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, though even so White would win by $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt3}$; $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ !, K-Kt1 (26 ..., P-B3; 27 R-Q7, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $28 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 29 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}) ; 27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 28$ Q-Kt3 ch, B-K3 (28 ..., K-B1; $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ); $29 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (29 $\ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5) ; 30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1 ; 31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; 32 R(B)-B7.

| 24 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Or 24 | $\ldots$, | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5} ;$ | $25 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, |  | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and $27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.

$25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
If $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$; $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{RP}$, and Black can resign.

| $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | R-Kt1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ | Resigns |

$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! ; $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}(11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{KKt} \times$ P), Q-Q2; or even $11 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ followed by Castling long.

## 11 Kt-R4 P-QKt3

Otherwise White could play 12 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, gaining the pair of Bishops.
12 P-QR3
B-K2
$13 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{R})-\mathrm{B} 3$
B-B3

14 B-R6
Also worth considering is 14 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, Kt-K2; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$. The further phase of the middle-game consists of a series of complicated manœuvres, by which White gains a slight superiority.

| $14 \ldots$ | O-O |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | Q-Q3 |
| $16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| $17 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} 4$ |  |
| Gaining advantage in space on the |  |
| K side. This move is safe for White, |  |

as the closed position does not allow Black to exploit the weakening of the pawn chain.
$18 \ldots$
$19 \ldots-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$
$19 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is weaker owing to
$20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ with a dangerous pin.

## $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$

Kt-R4
After this White decides to exchange Queens and pass to the endgame. Black could not oppose this; in the variation $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktl}$; 21 P-B3, P-B4; 22 B-Q3, Kt-B3; $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt1}$, White's position would be preferable.

| $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

Hoping to complicate the game.
$26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 5) \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
$27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$
Position after Black's 27th move


A cunning trap, the idea of which White discovers only some moves later.

## $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$

Natural, and ... bad! The right move is $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and after $28 \ldots$, B-K2; $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $30 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ White has a slight advantage.
28 ...
R-Q2
$29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$

Obviously $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $30 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ could not allure White.

| $29 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 31 Kt R 5 |  |

Kt-R5
The pawn cannot be taken because the piece would be lost.

## 31 ...

B-K3
Gradually White's mistake at his 28th move is being revealed.
At R5 the Knight is out of the game, the QKtP is weak, and White's K side hardly inspires confidence. On the other hand the apparently bad Black QB pawns prove invincible, both $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 7, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 33 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$; and $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ !; 33 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 ; 34 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !; 35 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ are equally bad for White. With the better continuation 32 R-Q1 Black could choose between a pawn sacrifice by $32 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $33 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $34 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $35 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ with exceilent chances, and the obvious $32 \ldots$, B-K4; 33 P-B4, B-B2; 34 P-B5, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 35 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ with a sharp game and an extra pawn.

White's next move is clearly bad; the Black Bishops gradually dominate all the board, while White's K side becomes irrevocably weak.

| 32 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ ! |

Position after Black's 33rd move


An unpleasant sally! A threat to win the KBP by $34 \ldots$. ., P-R5. To $34 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$ Black continues not $34 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 35 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{B} ; 37 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $38 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ and the win is problematical, but simply $34 \ldots$... B-B6, keeping up strong pressure.

Weaker is $33 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$; 34 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5!, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $35 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ !, P-B3; $37 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $38 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$.

34 Kt -B1
R-Q1
$34 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ is met by $35 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ attacking the BP. But Black has no need to hurry.
$35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$
B-R6
36 R-Q1

Loses a pawn and the game. But in any case there was no salvation. E.g. $36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, Kt-R5! is also of no use, and Black wins.

| $36 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $38 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $39 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $41 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $43 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

No. 28. Queen's Gambit Accepted

| M. Botvinnik (White) | $V$. Alatortsev (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Kt -KB3 | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | P-B3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-K3 |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

In sum we now have a Queen's Gambit Accepted.

| $6 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | O-O | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

An important move. $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ at

A graphic example of the Bishops' superiority to Knights.

| 44 | $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 45 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 46 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ |
| 47 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

$47 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$
B-Q4
$48 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$
Not, of course, $48 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, B-KB5; $49 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 8$, B-K6 ch; $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, B-Kt7 ch and $51 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

| $48 \ldots$ | B-KB5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $49 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B})-\mathrm{K} 2$ | B-K6 ch |
| $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | B-K5 |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | P-B4 |

The time has come when one Bishop can be exchanged against a Knight, which, incidentally, disposes of White's last chances.

| 52 | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K})-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 53 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 54 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 55 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 56 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 57 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ |
| 58 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 59 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 60 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 61 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6!$ |

White resigns, as even 62 Kt -B5 will not prevent Black playing $62 \ldots$, P-B6.
once is not so strong, as after $8 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ White has no advantage from 9 Q-K2, P $\times$ P; 10 R-Q1, P-K4, etc.

Black avoids $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ to no purpose; if White moves to prevent P QKt4, he must play $P-Q R 4$, so weakening his Q side.

| 8 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 10 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{O}$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt} 5$ |

A necessary manœuvre, ensuring that Black controls Q4; otherwise, with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ White is delivered from his one weakness, the isolated pawn,
and also opens up the game, which is to his benefit as his development is more advanced.

## 12 Kt-K5 QKt-Q4

Here the correct move is $12 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, as after $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 14 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{QKt}) \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 16 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KKt5} ; 17$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}!; 18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ Black equalizes the game. This variation was found by the master V. Chekhover.

## 13 B-KKt5

13 Q-B3 is worth considering, again attacking Q5. But it would appear that even so Black, with $13 \ldots$, Q-Q3 (followed by B-Q2) gets a satisfactory game.
$13 \ldots \quad$ P-KR3
$13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is followed simply by $14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ and the Q 4 pawn is well supported.

## 14 B-R4

B-Q2!

Weaker is $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 15$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ (16 ..., $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $17 \mathrm{Kt-Kt6);} \mathrm{Black}$ has prepared a shrewd continuation, the object of which will be gathered from our further comments. As White cannot allow B-B3, his reply is forced.

## $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Much weaker is $15 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$;
$18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, and Black is in no condition to hold out for long.

## $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$

There is nothing better. At first glance it seems that with $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ White wins the QKt pawn, as $16 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ is hopeless for Black. But in reality $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is followed by $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1!!; 18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 19 \mathrm{R}-$ $\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ! and Black wins back the piece with a probable draw:
$20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$; $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QKt5}$, Q-K5.

Position after Black's 15th move

16 ...
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$
$16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ immediately loses. $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} t 5$; $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! and White is a piece up.

## $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

$18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
White has the better of it after all, as Black's pawns are weakened and must be defended by pieces; White's pieces are posted more actively.
$18 \ldots$
QR-K1
Indirectly defending the QKtP. If $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ Black, by playing $19 \ldots$, B-R5; 20 P-QKt3, B $\times$ P restores equality in material.

| 19 R-K1 | Q-Kt5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 | B-Kt3 |

Obviously, not $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$; 21 QR-Q1. The defence Black has chosen is wrong. He quite uselessly doubles the Rooks on the KB file, where there is nothing for them to do. He should have withdrawn the Bishop to B1 and prepared to double Rooks on the Q file.
After Black has removed the Rooks from play White succeeds in forcing a Queen exchange and transposing to an advantageous endgame.

21 QR-Q1
R(K)-KB1
$22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$
K-R2
23 Q-Q2
Q-Kt3
24 R-K5 R-B5
25 Q-K3
At the moment $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ is no use because of $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QP}$ !; nor 25 Q-B3 (to play 26 Q-B5) because of $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$.

$$
25 \ldots \quad R(1)-B 3
$$

This makes it possible for White to transfer the Queen to B5, but it is doubtful whether Black has any better move.
26 Q-B3
B-B3

Now $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ would be met with $27 \ldots, B \times P$.
27 Q-B5 $\quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$
Now White has practically an extra pawn, as the four Black pawns on the K side can be held by White's three without difficulty. The result of the game is beyond doubt.
$28 \ldots$
R(5)-B4

Or $28 \ldots, \mathrm{R}(3)-\mathrm{B} 4$; $29 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 1$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, R-Q7 ch; 32 R-K2, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $33 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$, and White should win.
$29 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 1 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
Also bad: 29 ..., B-Q4; 30 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 31 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ (31 ..., $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} ; 32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ ); $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$, P-Q5; 33 P-QKt4.
$30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$
This simplification is tantamount to surrender, but in any case there is no salvation.

| No. 29. Queen's Indian Defence |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| V. Chekhover |  |$\quad$ M. Botvinnik

Position after Black's 30th move


```
\(\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{R}\)
```

$32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ P-KKt4
If $32 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; 33 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ and 34 B-K4.
$\begin{array}{ll}33 & \text { K-K3 } \\ 34 & \text { K-Q4 }\end{array} \quad$ K-Kt3
35 B-Q5
Forcibly transposing to a pawn endgame.

| 35 | P |
| :--- | :--- |
| $36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ |
| $37 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| $38 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 40 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |
| $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $42 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |

43 K-B5
White has various ways of winning.

| 43 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $45 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |

$45 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$
46 K-Kt5
Black resigns, as after $46 \ldots$. K-Q4; 47 K-Kt6, and White's pawn queens first.

| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

$7 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is regarded as a better continuation, leading to an equal game.

[^0]The right reply is: $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, giving White the advantage, as $8 \ldots$ $\mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ! is disastrous to Black.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
8 \\
9 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 4
\end{array} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

Here too $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ would be very strong. Now Black satisfactorily completes his development.
9 ...
QKt-Q2

## $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt} 5$

Unnecessary. 10 QR-B1 at once is simpler, forcing $10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$.
$10 \ldots$
Kt-K1
$10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ is out of the question in view of $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 12 B-Q6.

| 11 | QR-B1 | P-QB3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Kt-B3 | Kt-Q3 |
| 13 | Q-B2 |  |

A passive move, allowing Black to obtain the advantage. White should have exploited his better development and opened up the game at once by $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
$13 \ldots \quad$ P-KB4
Now we have something on the lines of the Dutch Defence.

## 14 B-KR3

## P-KKt3

Black defends the KBP, so as to manœuvre later with the Kt on Q3.

$$
15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2!
$$

Because of Black's threat P-KKt4Kt5 the Bishop at R3 must retreat. True, even so, by advancing his pawn Black squeezes out the White pieces and gains an advantage in space.

| 16 | B-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 | B-Q2 |
| 18 | Kt-K1! |

完
White finds the right manœuvre.

| $18 \ldots$ | B-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 P-K3 | Q-K2 |
| 20 Kt-Q3 | Kt-K5 |

A weak move, after which Black's game is easy. $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! was called for, followed by the Knight's transfer to K5. In this case, too, Black retains the initiative, but by occupying K5 White would at least slow up the tempo of the enemy attack.
$21 \ldots$
QR-B1
22 Q-Kt3
Black's next move is forced, because of the threat of $23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$. This could not be played at once because of 22 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! with an attack on the Queen.

## $22 \ldots \quad$ KR-K1

The simplest. Black secures the Knight at K5.
$\begin{array}{lll}24 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1 \\ 25 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3\end{array}$
$26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K} 3)$
Necessary, as after $26 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{QB})-\mathrm{K} 2$, $\mathrm{Kt}(3)-\mathrm{KKt4}$ ! some serious unpleasantness arises for White.

| $26 \ldots$ | Q $\times$ Kt |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 Kt-K2 | B-Kt4 |
| 28 Q-R3 | P-QR4 |

29 Q-Kt3
Leads to swift defeat, though even with $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $30 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3 ; 31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ White has a hard game.
29 ...
B-QR3

The Knight is forced back to his previous post: in the continuation $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $31 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 7$ White loses the exchange.

## $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$

- Black should have played at once $30 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QB} 5$, and $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ is out of the question because of $31 \ldots$, B-Q1; 32 Q-R7, R-K2.
$\begin{array}{ll}31 & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 \\ 32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2 & \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{B} 1\end{array}$
$32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
The Knight manœuvre does not save the game.


## 32 ... <br> Q-B2

More exact is $32 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ ! with the threat of $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ provoking 33 Kt-B4. But in any case there appears to be no satisfactory continuation for White.
$\begin{array}{ll}33 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 & \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \\ 34 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \text { ! }\end{array}$
White resigns. There is no defence against R-K3-R3. The final position deserves a diagram.

No. 30. Réti Opening

| G. Lisitsin (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Kt -KB3 | P-QB4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | P-Q4 |
| $4 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | Kt-QB3 |
| $6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |

Here $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! is more appropriate, with a good game for White. Now Black prohibits this move for a long time, which enables him to get an excellent game.

$$
6 \ldots \quad \text { P-K4 }
$$

The upshot is the "dragon" variation of the Sicilian Defence, with colours reversed, but with the advantageous move $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$.
$7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
8 QKt-Q2

8 QKt-Q2
Black's simplest reply to 8 Kt QB3, avoiding simplification, is 8 ..., Kt-B2!

| 8 | O-O |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

$10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$
B-K3
$11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$
Consolidates the position of the Knight, but weakens the $Q$ side. The sound plan for White in such positions is the preparation of

Position after Black's 34th move


P-KB4 (as in the Kashdan-Nimzovitch game at Bled in 1931, and the Botvinnik-Fine game at Nottingham, 1936). True, in the present game White has already posted his pieces in such a manner that it is not easy to carry out this plan.

Four of White's next nine moves are made with the Queen. That would rather suggest that he is playing without a plan.

Taking this into account, Black does not hurry with the organization of his attack, but for the time being methodically consolidates his position.

| 11 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
| 13 | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 14 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| 15 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 16 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 17 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$ |
| 18 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 19 | $\mathrm{Kt}(3)-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| 20 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5!$ |

Black dominates the whole board. White cannot set up even the ghost of a counter-game; he is forced to look on passively while his opponent reorganizes his ranks for a decisive attack.

## 21 Q-Q1 <br> B-Kt5

Black's design is now clear. White
is to be compelled to exchange a Q4; but this opens the K file, after which the Rooks can attack the backward pawn. White cannot advance the K pawn, for this would lead to the loss of the Q pawn.

Position after Black's 20th move

$22 \mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{~B} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{B}$
23 Q-Q2
B-B1

Clearing the K file.
24 R-K1
R-K1
The Knight must be developed at least "somewhere or other." With his next move Black offers an exchange of Bishops, which White avoids for the moment, as he wishes to keep the Bishop for defence of the KP.

| 25 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 B-B3 | B-R6 |
| 27 Kt-R2 | R-K2 |
| 28 K-R1 | R(B)-K1 |
| B-K3 |  |

With the obvious object of transferring the Bishop to Q4, where it will hold a stronger position. Incidentally, White might have had an opportunity to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ and R-Kt1, cutting off the Bishop.

## 29 P-Kt3 <br> Kt-Kt5

White hoped for $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B6, when he would have played $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, advancing the backward pawn
30 B-Kt2
B-Q4
$31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Still avoiding the exchange
31 ...
R-KB2
The Bishop at B1 must be brought into action.

| 32 | K-R2 |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad$ B-Q3 1 33 B-R3 $\quad$ Q-Q1

Now White himself is forced to seek exchange of Bishops, as he must not allow 37 ..., Q-Q4. Black's pieces are splendidly placed, and he is ready for the decisive attack. White's position is hopeless.

| 37 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $38 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $39 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
|  | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3!$ |

Position after Black's 39th move


There is no defence against $40 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$.

| $40 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |

## 42 Q-B4

Desperation! Both $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$, Q-Q4 ch; and $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$, Kt $\times \mathrm{P}$; $43 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, R-K6; $45 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch} ; 46$ K-Kt1, B-R7 ch are bad for White.

| 42 | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $43 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ch |
| $44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathbf{K t} \times$ QP |

## NINETEEN THIRTY-THREE

THis year was rich in chess events. During the previous December a training tournament of six masters had begun at the House of Scientists. It consisted of two rounds, and ended in January, 1933.
I began by losing to P. Romanovsky, and rather later to A. Ilyin-Zhenevsky. But, thanks to the two-round system, I managed to put matters right and finished by winning first place.
In the spring of 1933 there was a Masters' tournament in Leningrad. There were fourteen players, and after a tense struggle Romanovsky and I took joint first place.
The main event of the year was the U.S.S.R. Eighth Championship, which was held in August, also in Leningrad. It aroused very great interest. The Seventh Championship, held two years before, had not attracted all the finest Soviet players, notably Levenfish and Romanovsky being absent; but now all the masters of the older and the younger generation were competitors. The tournament ended in the victory of the younger men, and I once more won the Soviet Championship.
I played what was probably my best game of those years at this tournament, against V. Rauzer (No. 31). It was published in many of the world's periodicals; I think it was the first game of mine to become widely known.

During this time Ilyin-Zhenevsky was Councillor to the Soviet Embassy at Prague, and in the September Grand-Master Flohr, then champion of Czechoslovakia, suggested to him that a match should be organized between the Czech and the Soviet champion. The proposal was adopted, and Flohr arrived in Moscow not long after. The first half of the match took place in the Hall of Pillars in the House of the Trades Unions. It went unfavourably for the Soviet champion. In the first game I was caught in a simple trap, and in the sixth I suffered defeat in a difficult endgame.
The second half of the match was played at Leningrad, in the Great Hall of the Conservatoire. Flohr already felt confident of victory, and I rather think the "experts" shared his opinion. However, in the ninth game I at last won, and my opponent, rather disconcerted, failed to put up adequate opposition the next day. The result was the unexpected one of $+2,-2$ $=8!^{1}$
One result of this match was that the young generation of Soviet masters received its first international recognition.
U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP

## August

| No. 31. Sicilian Defence |  | $4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-B3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $V$. Rauzer | M. Botvinnik | $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-Q3 |
| (White) | (Black) | 6 B-K2 <br> Sometime | Rauzer's advice, |
| P-K4 | P-QB4 | $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ is p | preventing 6 ..., |
| $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-KKt3. So | ck wishes to adopt |
| P-Q4 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | the "dragon' | tion he must play |

$2 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3 ; \quad 3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 4 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$. When we played this particular game Rauzer had not made his researches. 6 ...

P-KKt3
For a long time "theory" regarded the "dragon", variation as not very satisfactory for Black, but it has reappeared in tournament practice.
7 B-K3
B-Kt2
$8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
A useful move, as otherwise Black frees his play with P-Q4. Black's next move is regarded as the strongest.

| $8 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $10 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |

Regarding 10 P-Kt4, see the Alekhine-Botvinnik game, No. 53, infra, and the Kann-Botvinnik game, No. 50, infra.
10 ...
Kt-QR4
$11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
The Black Knight could occupy a good position at B5, but it should not have been exchanged off, especially as the exchange had the effect of developing White's pieces.
The soundness of $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ has been proved by Becker. The point is that after $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 13 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 14 QR-Q1, Q-B2; $15 \mathrm{Kt-Kt5}$, QB5! White does not win the exchange. Apparently R. Spielmann found the right method of play here in 1934: $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ! 11 ...

$$
\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}
$$

The opening phase has ended, it would seem in Black's favour. His further play is beset with fewer difficulties than White's.

## 12 B-B3

The preliminary 12 Q-Q2 should have been preferred.
12 .

[^1]13 R-K1
14 Q-Q2
KR-Q1
In certain variations $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is unpleasant, forcing exchange of Queens.
15 QR-B1
After this passive move White at once gets involved in serious complications. The simplest here is Q-KB2, distracting Black from his plan of threatening the QRP.
$15 \ldots$
P-K4
Position after Black's 15th move


If White realized the point of this move he would continue simply $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ and $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, with an equal game; but to an immediate 16 Q-B2 Black would reply as in the text: $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, getting a good game, e.g. $17 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}(17 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P})$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}!; \quad 18 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP} ; \quad 19$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}(20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5), \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, etc.

## 16 P-QKt3 P-Q4!!

It seems this sacrifice is sound in all variations. Now $17 \ldots$, P-Q5 threatens.
$17 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !
$18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
White looks for counter-chances in acceptance of the sacrifice, choosing, it would seem, the most expedient way. This is evident from the following variations:
(1) $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ (not $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, because of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 6), \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$; and $22 \ldots$... B $\times$ KKtP.
(2) $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $19 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! If Black now wins the exchange by ..., B-Kt7 the situation is extremely complicated, and dangerous for Black owing to the weakness of his KR1-QR8 diagonal. But, as Becker showed, White's attack can still be repulsed, e.g. 21 ..., B-Kt7 (21 ..., B-K3; 22 P-B4, B-K4; 23 Q-B2, $\mathrm{B} \times$ KBP also in Black's favour); 22 Q-Kt4, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ (one can also continue as Tarrasch suggested: $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QBP}$ ); 23 Kt-B6 ch!, K-R1!; 24 Q-B3, B-Q7; 25 Q-Kt2, B-K3!; 26 Kt Q5 dis. ch (26 P-B4, Q-R4), B-B6; $27 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KBP}$; $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, to Black's advantage.

| $18 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times$ B |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 P-QB5 | Q-R4 |
| 20 R(K)-Q1 |  |

This gives Black a forced win. Bad of course, is $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ (to meet the threat of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ), $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ (22 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; and $23 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ), P-B7 ch; $23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ in Black's favour. Also after $20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ White gets a far from pleasant endgame with a weak pawn formation.

The correct continuation is 20 QQ3!, e.g. $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, P-B4; $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch} ; 23$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 24 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}(25 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3) ; 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ and the opponents have approximately equal chances in the endgame.

```
20 ...
```

Kt-Kt5!
21 B-Q4

All the same, preference should have been given to $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, but even then after $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; $24 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ Black has every justification for counting on victory in the endgame.

But now follows an unexpected mating attack with Queen and Knight, the Queen playing the decisive role, transferring in three moves from the Q to the K side.

```
21 .
P-B7 ch
22 K-B1
```

$22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ could be followed by 22 $\ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! ; $23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch}$ ! and White has lost his Queen.

22 ..
Q-R3 ch
Position after Black's 22nd move


23 Q-K2
Other defences are still worse: $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; or $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch} ; 25 \mathrm{~K}-$ $\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch} ; 26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ and White has lost a piece.
$23 \ldots \quad B \times B$
$24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$
Q-KB3!
$25 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B})-\mathrm{Q} 1$
Or 25 Q-Q3, R-K1; 26 R-K4, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $27 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$; and there is no defence against $28 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; but if $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, then 26 . . . , R-K6; 27 Q-Q2, QR-K1.

| 25 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} \mathbf{~ c h}$ |

Black could win in various ways. Tarrasch pointed out an interesting method: $28 \ldots$, QR-Q1!; 29 Q$\mathrm{Kt5}$ (or $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$; $30 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} ; 31 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}), \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$;

## No. 32. Grünfeld Defence

| M. Botvinnik | M. Yudovich |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

Ragozin recommended this move, to be followed by $5 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$. Here $4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ immediately is also possible, this being first played in my game against Levenfish rather later in the same tournament. After the U.S.S.R. Eighth Championship the system with Q-Kt3 was thoroughly studied by many masters, but so far no absolutely reliable antidote has been found to it; the most serious reply is the counter-system developed by Smyslov, involving B-KKt5.

| $4 \ldots \mathrm{~B}$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $5 \underset{\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3}{ }$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $6 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}}{ }$ |  |

$6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
P-B3

Now $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is not good for Black because of $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, but the text continuation is quite acceptable. $6 \ldots$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$
If now $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, then $7 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4!$; $9 \mathrm{~B}-$ $\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; which leads to an equal game.

| 7 B-Q2 | O-O |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 | P-K4 |

At one time Tarrasch declared that in the Queen's Gambit Knights are always posted badly at QKt3,
$30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $31 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch}$. $29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2 \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$

White resigns, as he loses the exchange and has a hopeless position: $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} ; 31 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$; $32 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
This game was awarded the brilliancy prize.
whether White or Black. This assertion has long since ceased to be accepted as true, but in the given position the Black Knight is in fact badly posted at $\mathrm{QKt3}$. Its activity is reduced to the minimum, it only interferes with the development of the Q side, and serves as a convenient target to be fired at.
The right move is $8 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ leaving White with an almost imperceptible advantage.

Black evidently assumed that White would be forced to defend the $Q$ pawn; then would follow: $9 \ldots$. B-K3 and $10 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 5$ or $\mathrm{Kt}-$ QB5. But White has a strong reply at his disposal, one which was after all not so difficult to foresee, parrying both threats.

## 9 QR-Q1!

It transpires that Black cannot seize the initiative. He cannot take the QP; and $9 \ldots$, B-Kt5; 10 B-K3 does not promise well, as an exchange at KB3 is of advantage to White. So Black aims at P-K4. However, later it transpires that this plan is also impossible. Hence it is clear that Black should have played 9 $\ldots, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; 11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $K t \times B ; 12 B-B 1, K t-Q 2$, somewhat easing the pressure.

## 9 ... QKt-Q2

With the idea of playing P-K4 if opportunity arises. Before forestalling this move, White forces a weakening of QKt3.

10 P-QR4 P-QR4
Necessary, otherwise 11 P-R5.

## 11 B-K3

A remarkable situation has arisen. The ill-fated Knight at Kt3 is the cause of all Black's difficulties. It has not one move, and moreover it has to be defended twice over, as White continually threatens $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$. As a result five of Black's piecesthe Queen, a Rook, a Bishop, and the two Knights-are fettered. Now Black cannot even dream of a breakthrough with P-K4.

However, it is still not a simple matter to win.

| $11 \ldots$ | Q-B2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Q-Q3 |

Intending with $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ to eliminate the attack on the Knight. White of course must prevent this.
13 Kt -R2 P-K3
It is doubtful whether Black would do any better with $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt3}, \mathrm{Kt}-$ B3; $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt} 3)-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 17$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$; $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 4$.
14 O-O
P-R3
Position after Black's 14th move


Black's plan is to free a square for the Knight on Kt3. Only then will he be able to develop the Q side. By advancing the KBP two squares he proposes to liquidate White's KP and
thus get a base for his Knight at Q4. The immediate $14 \ldots$, P-KB4 would not achieve his end, as White would play $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$; $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! guarding the KP; so now Black prevents the manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$. At this stage White saw that if he played $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !! followed by P-KB3 Black would be fettered and would be unable to free himself. However, White mistakenly decided that P-KB4 was impossible for Black in any case. Unfortunately, as the result the game lost its point.
$15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$
P-KB4
$16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Forced. White proposed to play $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, but now he noticed that Black has the simple reply $16 \ldots$, P-B5! Nor could he do anything with $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{QP}$; $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}!$; $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; and if $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, then $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$. So White defends the KP and the King's Bishop.
$16 \ldots \quad$ K-R2
Parrying the threat of $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, which now would be met by $17 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{KP}!$; $18 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. 17 KR-Q1 $\quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

Now there again threatens 18 P Q5, and if $18 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}$ Black's Queen is threatened. This forces Black to exchange at K5.

## $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ <br> Q-Kt5

Pawn hunting is equivalent to surrendering the game. It does not even call for any calculation to realize how dangerous is the Black King's situation. Black should have played $18 \ldots$ Q-K2; though even in this case there is the continuation 19 Q-B2, Kt-Q4; $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ ! and $\mathrm{KKt3}$ has a very susceptible weakness.
19 Q-B2
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}$
$20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$
Q-R6

## $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ !

Nothing comes of the sacrifice: $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Pch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$; and Black has everything guarded.

But now Black cannot defend the pawn on Kt3. $21 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is demolished by $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, or if 21 ..., P-R5; 22 R-Kt1, P $\times$ P; 23 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7$; $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{t} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$;

25 Q-Kt1 and Black cannot force the exchange of Queens.
21 ...
Q-K2
$22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
A win also follows $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ and $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$, double-check.
$22 \ldots$
$\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K t}$
23 B-R5 ch!!

Black resigns, as mate is inevitable.

## MATCH WITH FLOHR

November-December

## NINTH GAME

No. 33. Caro-Kann Defence

| M. Botvinnik | S. Flohr |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |  |

I think this is the first time this system had ever been played. It is not at all easy for Black to defend Q4.
In the present game Black gives up altogether any attempt to keep the pawn on Q4 and at once gets a bad position. Of recent years many and various systems have been proposed for Black. But I am still convinced that $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ is one of the strongest of continuations.
$6 \ldots$

$$
\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

Black gives up the centre and makes it possible for White to advance his centre pawn, which makes Black's development difficult. Soon after this game theoreticians came to the conclusion that here the best continuation is $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$.

## 7 P-Q5 Kt-K4

Analyses published in the 1930s show that after $7 \ldots$, Kt-QR4;
$8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ !, White gets a stronger attack for the pawn sacrifice.

| $8 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

Position after White's 10th move


In the first game of this match I played $10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and got the worse game. But after analysis at home I was convinced that if $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3 ; 11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! , $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 12 \mathrm{Q} \times$ QP Black has a very bad position (the Bishop at KB1 has no move, and the King is stranded in the centre), and I decided to play this variation again.
It is unnecessary to say that $10 \ldots$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is also bad, and Black cannot resist for long. White's chief advantage lies in his superior development. In all variations his
attack grows threatening before Black can bring his reserves into the battle.

Black's reply here cannot be recommended in any circumstances.

## $10 \ldots$ <br> P-KKt3 <br> $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Naturally this is now very strong, as by comparison with the first game of the match White has won an important tempo and his Rooks begin to work along the central files with terrible strength. In certain variations the passed QP is also very unpleasant to Black.

| $11 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

One can confidently say that Black's game is lost. There is no relief for him in $12 \ldots$, B-K2; 13 QR-Q1! (not so good is 13 Kt K4, Q-Kt3!; 14 P-Q6, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$; $16 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 17 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2), \quad \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; $14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KB} 4$; $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, and Black must surrender. It is possible that at one point or another Black could improve on this play, but that cannot modify in any essential this estimate of the position. Black decided to reconcile himself to being unable to Castle, hoping that at Q1 the King would find a reliable haven. But unfortunately, in an open position and with a completely undeveloped army such play in the spirit of Steinitz cannot save the game.

## 13 KR-K1 ch K-Q1 <br> 14 Q-KR4!

The strongest continuation of the attack. With $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ! it is doubtful whether White would be able to carry his positional advantage to victory.

White's main threat is $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !
with decisive superiority, e.g.: 14 ..., B-Q2; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1$; 16 Kt-B4, Q-R3; 17 P-Q6, or $14 \ldots$, B-Kt2; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times$ RP. White's simplest reply to $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ is $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16 \mathrm{QR}-$ Q1 !, B-Q2 (16 ..., B-KB4; 17 KtQ4); 17 R-K3. An alternative "desperate" defence against Kt-K5 is the one Black decides to adopt.

Position after White's 14th move

14.

P-Kt4
15 Q-R5
$15 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is followed at least by $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, and the Black pawns vanish one after another. Black "develops" two pieces, but at the price of two good pawns, giving White superiority in material.

| $15 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{Q} \times$ BP | R-B1 |
| $17 \mathrm{Q} \times$ RP | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ ! |

The sole chance of getting counterplay. $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ (reckoning on $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 19 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $20 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1)$ is met by $18 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ ! and complications not entirely without possibilities for Black result. So White's withdrawal of the Knight is forced.
$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Naturally, } \\ & \text { hopeless for Black, as it is followed }\end{aligned}$
ar by $19 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ with unrelenting
attack. But now White must play with great care. Thus, if $19 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $B \times Q$; it is far from so simple to win the QP , and even if White did, the endgame would still present great technical difficulties. The following move shatters Black's hopes.

Position after Black's 18th move


## 19 Q-R6!

Weak would be $19 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q P}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; $20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, and the White King finds himself in a dangerous situation.

But now there is a threat of 20 Kt-Kt5. The Rook on B1 is not reliably defended, so Black hastens to cover it with the Queen.
$20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B}$
Q-B2

A loss also follows $20 \ldots$, B-Kt5; $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, QKt1; $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; or $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Ktl}$; 21 P-Q6, R-KKt1; 22 R-K7, Q$\mathrm{Kt} 3(22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP})$; 23 Q-KB4.

Now White captures a second pawn, in doing so depriving Black of his "pair of Bishops," and transposes to the endgame. The rest is a question of technique.
Later Tafrasch showed that White could win also with a direct attack after $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$. Yet I think that if I had again to play White in this position I would play as in the game, for in an elementary won position a
master should choose the simplest road.

| $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |

Yet another attempt to complicate the game.

| 27 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\mathbf{P}-K R 3$ |

Position after Black's 28th move


## $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !

The last finesse. If $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t} ; \quad 30 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch; 31 $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q B} 1$ the result would still be in doubt, as the White pawns would fall one after another.
With the next move Black allows the White King to pass into the centre, after which further resistance is futile. But even if $29 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 7$; $30 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$; $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ !, R B8 ch; 32 K-R2, R-Q8; 33 RK7 ch, K-B3; 34 P-Q7, K-B2; 35 Kt -B5! White queens his pawn.

| $29 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \underset{\mathbf{K}}{ } \times \mathbf{R}$ | R-B1 ch |
| $31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

If 31 ..., B-K7; $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$.

| 32 | P-Kt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 | R-K6 |$\quad$ B-Kt3

## TENTH GAME

No. 34. Dutch Defence

|  | S. Flohr <br> (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | P-Q4 | P-K3 |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-KB4 |
| 3 | P-KKt3 |  |

Theoretically this continuation (the King's fianchetto) is regarded as White's best line against the Dutch Defence. In the fourth game of our match Flohr played $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$.

| $3 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 B-Kt2 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

Black refrains from the exchange of Bishops ( $4 \ldots$, B-Kt5 ch) in order to avoid simplification, and plans to employ the stonewall formation (see also game No. 4, supra). When this game was played it was considered that this variation ceded White unquestioned superiority, but the system contains quite a lot of poison, and against an opponent who has not thorough knowledge of the game it can be applied confidently.
$5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$
6 Kt -B3

At one time Grünfeld recommended $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$. This move was adopted in the Capablanca-Botvinnik game (Hastings, 1934-35) where White obtained superiority. So in the preceding move Black's most exact play would have been $5 \ldots$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ and only after $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ should he have played $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; but if 5 ..., O-O; 6 Kt -R3 Black can reply $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.

| $6 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |  |
| Ignorance | of |
| the variation is |  |

beginning to reveal itself. Here Flohr does not choose the strongest continuation.


At this time it was considered that 8 B-B4 can give White the better game. Chekhover's system is now regarded as very strong: 8 Q-B2!, Q-K1; $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ! followed by $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, reducing to a minimum the Black forces available for attack on the K side. The fianchetto of the Queen's Bishop has one serious defect: it weakens KB4, after which Black's pressure on the $K$ side increases considerably.
8 ...
Q-K1

The customary move in this variation to transfer the Queen to KR5, both for attack, and to defend the KB pawn.
9 B-Kt2 $\quad$ QKt-Q2
10 Q-Q3
Another slightly inexact move. The Queen is more effective on B 2 . Now the simplest would have been $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt5}$, B-Q3; 11 P-KB4, closing the position and depriving Black of his chances of attack on the K side.
10 ...
Q-R4

Just in time, for White threatens $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! opening the QB file.

## $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$

White should make this exchange only when it gives some advantage at once. Otherwise it leads only to a deterioration of the position.

The continuation $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ or $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ does not suit White because of $11 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !; $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$. But from this it is evident that the Bishop was badly placed at QKt2 and the mistake should have been recognized, transferring it to KB4, so eliminating any possibility of a break-through with ..., P-K4.

```
11 ..
\(\mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{P}\)
```

$12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
This also is a mistake. White's sound plan consisted in playing P-KB4 and capturing K5. But this necessitated $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ! followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3-\mathrm{K} 5$. But now Black can prevent this manœuvre.
12.
P-B3

Kt-K5

Exactly! $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is followed by $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)!; 14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; and Black controls K5, while it is extremely difficult for White to transfer the Knight to his K5.

## 13... <br> $K t \times \operatorname{Kt}(B)$

The only way. After $13 \ldots$, $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2) ; 14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ White would succeed in defending KB4.

## $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

P-B5!
The signal for attack. Black develops continuous pressure on the K side, and it is not easy for White to free himself. Possibly $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ would be stronger than the text move, leaving K1 free for the Bishop. The Rook must vacate B1 to make room for the Knight to defend the KKtP.

Position after Black's 14th move


| $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

An important move. $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-$ B 3 is not good, as with $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! White would attack the KBP, and if $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ the White Bishop would operate actively along the QB1-KR6 diagonal. So Black frees KB1 for his Knight. Even so it would be better for White now to play 17 B-Q2.

Instead, with his next move he closes the QB1-KR6 diagonal, after which Black exchanges at $\mathrm{KKt6}$ with advantage. Bad for White is 17 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! ; $18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}(18 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-B6!), Kt-B3.
17 P-K3
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
$18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$

Forced. $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ might be fol lowed by either $18 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! or simply $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4} ; 19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} ; 20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$; or $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, to Black's clear advantage.

| $18 \ldots$ | Q-R5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 Kt-B1 | Kt-B3 |
| 20 R-K2 | B-Q2 |

White pins great hopes to the transfer of the Bishop to KKt3, but it cannot essentially improve his position.

21 B-K1 Q-Kt4

After $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$; White is forced to play $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$, as 24 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ is met by $24 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ !

$$
23 \text {... }
$$

This is the beginning of the decisive attack. The threat of P-R5-6, winning a piece, forces a further weakening of White's pawn position.

```
24 P-B4
Q-Kt5
25 R-KB2
```

Possibly 25 R-KB1 would have been somewhat better.

## 25 <br> B-B3

P-R5

An obvious oversight. In justice' name we note that even with 26 P KR3!, Q-K3 (26 ..., Q $\times$ Kt; 27 R-B3); $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ White's position is a lost one.
$26 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

## NINETEEN THIRTY-FOUR

After the match with Flohr Soviet masters had a further test in the tournament in which the foreign players Euwe and Kmoch took part.

Euwe was already one of the strongest grand masters of the West, while Kmoch was an experienced international master.

Euwe took the lead at first, but then he lost to Riumin and Rabinovich and lost all chance of being highly placed. I also began by losing to Lisitsin, but I gradually improved my position. A decisive game with Rabinovich, which lasted ten hours, ended in his defeat, and so I took first place, half a point above Riumin and Romanovsky. Rabinovich was fourth, Kann was fifth, Euwe sixth, and Kmoch and Yudovich jointly occupied seventh and eighth places.
This second international "examination" was passed with honour by the Soviet masters, not only by their position in the score-table, but also by their creative play.

Among other chess events of 1934 I must mention the Trade Union Match between Moscow and Leningrad, in which I had two interesting games with Belavenietz.

The Queen-sacrifice is decisive.
$27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch
$28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$

After $28 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; the KP also is lost.

| $28 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $30 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |
|  | Resigns |

$31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ is followed by $31 \ldots$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch, or the transfer $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, K3-KKt3 with a mating attack.
Position after White's 26th move


## LENINGRAD-MOSCOW TRADE UNION MATCH May

No. 35. Queen's Indian Defence

|  | S. Belavenietz <br> (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | P-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-K3 |
| 3 | Kt-KB3 | P-QKt3 |
| 4 | P-KKt3 | B-Kt2 |
| 5 | B-Kt2 | B-K2 |
| 6 | O-O | O-O |
| 7 | Kt-B3 | P-Q4 |
| 8 | Kt-K5 | Q-B1 |
| 9 | B-B4 |  |

A single formal move can spoil any position. With 9 B-B4 White loses the initiative at the least. The right move, of course, is $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, to restrict the Queen's Bishop's sphere of operations.
$9 \ldots$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$
This is a simply losing mistake, whereas after $10 \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $11 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \mathrm{ch} ; 12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 14 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 \quad(14 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; 15 R-Kt1, P-QR3; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ); $15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}, \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1 ; 16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, Kt-B3 Black's position is only very slightly better. Now White gets a weak QP.
10 ...
B $\times$ B
$11 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$
Q-Kt2 ch

Not $11 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ at once, as
White could continue $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$,
P-B4; 13 Q-B3! saving the QP.

| $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Q-B2! | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

The Q4 pawn is indirectly defended, as $13 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QP}$ is met by $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, R-Q2; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, and White wins Black's QBP square.
13 ...
Kt-B3
14 P-K

Position after White's 14th move


An extremely interesting situation. At first glance it seems that Black can win the Bishop at B4, by continuing $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; and if 15 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3$; $18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ the Bishop is lost. But if 14 ..., Kt-Q4 White saves the piece by $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! as $15 \ldots$ P-KKt4; $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 17 Q-Kt4, PKR3; 18 P-KR4, involves great complications. So Black decides on the Rook sacrifice, which gives him an all but irresistible attack.

| $14 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}!!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |

16 Q-B1
After this Black's sacrifice is more than justified, as at any moment he can win back the piece. Even so 16 Q-R4, Kt-B6 ch; 17 K-R1, P-K4! (forestalling the manœuvre Kt-K3-Kt2); 18 B-K3, P-QR3!! (or the preliminary KR4) is more satisfactory and there is no defence against Black's combined threats.

| 16 | Kt-B6 ch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 K-R1 | P-K4 |
| 18 B-K3 | Kt-Kt5 |

Being a Rook down, Black gets nervous and tries to force the game.

But there was no necessity. White is in a helpless position and so Black should have intensified his pressure with $18 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ or $18 \ldots$, R-Q1.
If White then played $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$, in order to transfer the Knight to Kt1, $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ would be relevant, for in that case White has abandoned control of his K4.

Now Black wins back a piece, but finds himself forced to transpose to the endgame, where his chances of winning are minimal.

| $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ dis. ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ dis. ch |
| $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |

Otherwise $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ ! is very unpleasant.

| 24 Q-K2 | Q $\times$ Q |
| :---: | :---: |
| $25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | P-K5 |
| Fixing his KB6. |  |
| 26 P-QKt3 | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B})-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 27 P-KR3 | Kt-B6 ch |
| $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | Kt(5)-K4 |
| 29 B-K3 | P-KB4 |
| $30 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | K-B2 |
| $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |  |

Very weak: White loses several tempi. The logical continuation is 31 QR-B1, P-QB4; 32 R-Q5, PKt3; 33 R(B)-Q1, and Black has only a microscopic advantage. Later White is deprived of the possibility of doubling Rooks, and he has to be content with passive defence.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $32 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | at | once is simpler. |
| 33 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 34 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Kt 2 Q 6 |
| 36 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{QR} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

39 K-K2
P-QB4
$40 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt1}$

Position after Black's 40th move


In this highly instructive situation the game was adjourned and, in accordance with the rules of the tournament, submitted for adjudication. The jury of the match-the masters N. Grigoriev, I. Rabinovich, and $P$. Romanovsky-refused to make any decision without detailed analysis. However, the organizers of the match decided not to await an analysis and declared the position drawn.

As was to have been expected, the analysis of the adjourned position led to rather different conclusions. First let us assume that White pursues passive tactics, e.g. playing $41 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B})-\mathrm{B} 1$. If then Black succeeds in exchanging Bishops and occupying Q5 with his Knight, the game is obviously decided. It is easy to see that after $41 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 42 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ! Black achieves a win without difficulty. But if White plays 41 K-K3, Black can reply simply 41 $\ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$, so threatening $42 \ldots$, Kt-Q5.

As passive tactics lead swiftly to defeat White has no other course than to seek complications with $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$. But if Black plays at once $40 \ldots$, P-QR4 this possibility of counter-play is eliminated. Black
must accept the sacrifice, as otherwise, as analysis shows, it is hardly possible for him to win. But after $41 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $43 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ (otherwise Black gradually frees himself with R-Q2, K-K2 and B-K4 and, having three pawns for the exchange, should win), $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$; 44 P-QR4, Kt-K4; $45 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} ; 46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7} ; 47 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$,

No. 36. Queen's Gambit Declined

| M. Botvinnik (White) | S. Belavenietz (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Kt -KB3 | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-QB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-B3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-K3 |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | QKt-Q2 |
| 6 Kt -B3 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | P-QKt4 |

The so-called Meran Variation, introduced by Rubinstein.

| 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $13 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

White chooses Relstab's Attack, whereas to-day $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is preferred. It is interesting to note that, when commentating a game in which 13 Q-B3 was played, followed by 13 ..., B-Kt5 ch; $14 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$; 15 Q-Kt3! Euwe remarked that even with Black's best reply $15 \ldots$, QQ3!, after $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ White has the better endgame. Evidently this was a misapprehension, as after $15 \ldots$, Q-Q3; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 17$ $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ !; $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ it is difficult to see why Black's game is inferior.
I still think that $130-\mathrm{O}$ promises White more chances.
13
3 ...
Q-Q4

B-Kt5; 48 R-B2, B-B4; 49 R(Kt) $\times$ $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$; or $47 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$; $48 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ (at Kt7), R-B5; and Black's superiority is sufficient to win.

These variations essentially exhaust the position. Altogether it was an interesting game, though it has to be admitted that neither player proved quite equal to the problems confronting him.

## 14 Q-K2 <br> R-R4

Belavenietz had prepared this "novelty." But of course it is not by this means that the Relstab Attack can be refuted! The Rook at R4 has no scope, and White has an almost forced win.

## 15 P-B4!

An indispensable preliminary move. For if opportunity occurs Black plays $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ with an attack on the Knight at K5, so it is necessary to control this square at once. In doing so White defends the KKt square. Naturally, the formal 15 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ and then $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ would be weaker, as the Queen's Bishop is necessary for attack on the Rook at R4.

$$
15 \ldots \quad \text { B-Q3 }
$$

Black must develop his King's Bishop without delay. 15 ..., B-Kt2 is followed by the beautiful blow $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4!, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, and Black perishes because of the threat $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$.
16 B-Q2 P-Kt5
$17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3!$
Temporarily surrendering a second pawn, in return for an overwhelming attack. $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $18 \mathrm{Kt}-$ Kt6, Q-Kt2 does not lead to the desired result; Black has a satisfactory defence.

But now, in view of the threat $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ Black is forced to fight for
his K4. $17 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ is followed by at any rate $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ !
17 ...
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$
19 Q-B3
Q-Q4

Position after Black's 19th move


A better defence is $19 \ldots, \mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R} 2$; 20 QR-K1 (but not 20 Q-B6 ch, B-Q2; 21 Q-Kt6, Q-B2; 22 Q× KtP, which Black was afraid of because of $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; 23 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}), \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ (or $21 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 7, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$,

R-K2; 25 R-QB1, B-Kt2; 26 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ ); $22 \mathrm{Q}-$ Kt8 ch (or simply $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ), $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 24 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ (at R7), $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and White has all the chances of winning. With the text move Black loses a tempo by comparison with the foregoing variation, as if $19 \ldots$..., R-R2 White is compelled to play 20 QR K 1 , which is now useless.

## 20 Q-Kt3

R-R2
Black's situation is hopeless. He is not saved by $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$. It is interesting that White's position is now so strong that he is ensured the win even if he gives the next move to his opponent, as then the variation given in the preceding note should arise.

| $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt7}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |
|  | Resigns |

## TOURNAMENT WITH EUWE PARTICIPATING

August

No. 37. Queen's Gambit Declined

| $\quad$M. Botvinnik <br> (White) | $V$. Alatortsev <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | P-Q4 |
| 2 | P-QB4 |
| 3 | Kt-KB3 |

As Alatortsev explained after the game, the idea of this move is that Black plays $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ only after the White Knight has gone to QB3. In essence it all amounts simply to a change in the order of moves.

| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | O-O |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-QR3 |

This move is usually made only after $\mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$. True, Black later had the option of returning to the usual variation, but to do so would have needed very exact play. So the course taken by Black can hardly be recommended.

$$
7 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

$7 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ is worth considering.

$$
8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3
$$

This natural move turns out to be a serious mistake. After the game Alatortsev pointed out the right continuation $8 \ldots$, QKt-Q2!, and if 9 Q-B2, R-K1; 10 P-KKt4, KtKB1! Black gets a satisfactory game


With the definite threat through $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ of winning the KRP. The pawn sacrifice $10 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$; $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 13 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$; 15 P-KR4, B-Q3, gives Black some counter-play, but White's superiority in material should in due course make itself felt.
With 10 ..., P-KR3; 11 B-B4 (or $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ) White retains a strong attack. Possibly Black has a better defence with 10 ..., P-KKt3, though even then the continuation $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ and $12 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is to White's advantage.

Black chooses the weakest of con-

| No. 38. Slav Defence |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| M. Botvinnik (White) | I. Rabinovich (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-QB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-K3 |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | QKt-Q2 |
| 6 B-Q3 | B-K2 |
| Black avoids the Meran Variation |  |
| (6 . . , P $\times$ P | - $\times$ BP, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$; |
| 8 B-Q3, P-QR | etc.,) evidently |

tinuations, at once opening files for White on the K side.

| $10 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |  |

After 12 P-R4, $12 \ldots$. P-KKt3; 13 P-R5 ( $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, P-KKt4; and $15 \ldots$ Kt-R3; or $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1), \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ ! and Black should win.

White avoids premature exchanges.
12
2 ...
$\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)-\mathrm{B} 3$

Black's situation is serious, but manœuvres with the Knight are completely fruitless. In any case it is doubtful whether any method of defence can be found for Black. White can unhurriedly bring up reserves for the decisive blow.

| 14 P-KR3 | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt} 5)-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 B-K5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| 16 O-O-O | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| 17 QR-Kt1 | B-K3 |
| 18 Q-K2 | B-KB4 |

18 Q-K2 B-KB4
An oversight which hastens Black's collapse. Even so there is no defence against $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ or 19 Kt-R4.
$19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$
$20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KR} 4$
Resigns
with a view to adopting the so-called "improved Slav Defence": 7 O-O, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} ; 8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-QKt3. However, White avoids premature simplification.

| 7 | O-O | O-O |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | P-QKt3 | P-QKt3 |
| 9 | Q-K2 | B-Kt2 |
| 10 KR-Q1 | Q-B2 |  |
| 11 | B-Kt2 | QR-Q1 |

$11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q}$
12 QR-B1
White pursues a waiting tactic, planning eventually to establish his

Knight on K5; but he plays insufficiently exactly and only induces Black to move his Queen to a better square. The right move is $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ at once.
12 ...
Q-Ktl
13 P-KR3

There is nothing in $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 15 P-B4, Kt-B4; 16 B-B2, $\quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$. Black should now, I think, play $13 \ldots$. P-B4; $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ with more or less the continuation $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \quad \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16$ $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ ! though even then White's position is to be preferred.

After Black's text move White opens the centre with advantage.
$13 \ldots$
B-Q3
A serious error! Evidently Black was preparing for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, but forgot that White also might play: $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. With the Black Bishop at K2 White could not play $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, as then would have followed $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}$; $14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$; $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and White's Queen's Bishop is rendered harmless. Now the position is different: although Black's Bishop reaches KB5 with a gain of tempo, it is not well placed there, a circumstance which White later exploits.

Position after Black's 13th move

14 P-K4
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K P}$

Necessary: if $14 \ldots, B-B 5$ at
once, White sacrifices with 15 P-K5! and gets a stronger attack on the Black King.
$15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
B-B5
$15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-$ KB ; $17 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ is disadvantageous for Black.
$16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$
An important intermediary move: if $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$, Black has equal chances.
16 ...
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
17 R-Kt1 P-QB4
Black cannot delay. If he plays $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ (in order after $18 \ldots$, P-B4 to fight for control of B4 with his Knight) there follows 18 P-QKt4! and White has the superiority both in $18 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 ; 19 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 4$; 22 Q-K4, P-Kt3; $23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q}$; $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $29 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; and in 18 ..., R-K1; 19 B-R1.
$18 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B P} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$18 \ldots, \mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $19 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ! is no better, as White still prevents B-K4.

## $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ <br> Q-R1

It is difficult to indicate any other possibility of counter-play. White intended to clear up the position with $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$. This move is possible even now, but Black would be in possession of the QR1-KR8 diagonal. However, White finds a stronger continuation.
$20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
B-KR3

The other defence of KKt2 by 21 ..., P-K4, after the simple $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ! leads only to a weakening of the King's pawn. Impossible is $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $24 B \times R P$ ch, and White wins. 22 B-B6

R-Q2

Position after Black's 22nd move


If $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ Black has surrendered the Q file without a fight; but if $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, B-K5; then 24 R-Kt3!!, B-Kt3; 25 Q-R4, and White remains the exchange to the good.

Even so Black should have chosen the first possibility, as now with an interesting sacrifice of his two Bishops for a Rook White could get decisive superiority, namely: 23 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} ; 24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, and then:
(1) $24 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 27$ $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt2;} 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 29 Q-R5 ch, K-Kt1; $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, B-B3; 31 R-K7, Q-KB1; 32 RQB7!! and White should win.
(2) $24 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8$, P $\times$ B; 26 R(Kt)-Q1, Q-Kt2; 27 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} ; 28 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 29 Q-R4 ch, B-R3; 30 R-K8, QQ2; $31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8$, with a won endgame for White. Neither player notices this possibility, and this reduces the value of this seemingly effective game.

Now the play passes to the endgame and is drawn out over many moves.
23 B-B1
Q-B1

The Q file is surrendered after all, but at least the Queen's position is improved.
$24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$

25 R-Q1 Q-B2
A crucial point. White's attack has got into a blind alley, and no ways of strengthening it are evident. E.g. to $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ Black replies 26 ..., B-K5!; $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 28 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{K}), \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1!$; followed by 29 $\ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4!$ and a safe draw, despite White's extra pawn. So White does not fall for the "allure" of "lone attacks," and sets to work to realize his pawn superiority on the Q side, exploiting his domination of the open Q file.

| 26 B-Kt5 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 Q $\times$ B | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ |
| 28 Q-Q2 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |

Black could keep the Bishop on the Q side, but in that case he could not compel White to exchange Queens, as in the game. On the other hand, in the ensuing endgame the Bishop on the R2-Kt8 diagonal is out of play, and White now exploits this.

| $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 8$ |

Black can compel the Queen exchange only by this threat of winning a pawn. But now White gains an important tempo for the advance on the Q side.
$32 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$
33 P-QR3!

Position after White's 33rd move


White's superiority in the endgame is taking on definite outlines. As the continuation $33 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$; 34 R-Q8 ch, K-R2; 35 R-QKt8 and $36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ is clearly not to Black's advantage, he is forced to allow a further advance of the QKtP.

| 33 | R-Kt2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | R-Kt2 | B-Kt3 |
| 35 | P-QKt4 | K-B1 |

Both now and later Black is faced with the choice:
(1) With $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ he can force the advance of the QKtP. But then White will occupy the $Q$ file and, exploiting the weakness of the Black QR and QB pawns, should win without difficulty.
(2) Black can exchange at Kt5. This too is bad, as although the weak QBP is freed, White gets the QR file.
(3) Black can pursue waiting tactics. This is sound and he does so.

| 36 | K-B2 | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 39 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |

Nothing in 39 ..., P-R3; 40 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $41 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! (not 41 $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$, as this leads after 41 . $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ and $42 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ to a draw) and White occupies the QR file.

## $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ <br> > P-B3 <br> <br> P-B3

 <br> <br> P-B3}If $40 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt3}$; 41 R-Q2. Probably it would be simplest of all for White to play $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, but the continuation he chooses is perfectly sound.

## 41 P-R5 <br> P-K4

The Black Rook cannot abandon the QKt file because of the constant threat of P-Kt6 ch. Now, having posted his pawns to the best advantage, White improves the position of his pieces.
42 R-Q2
B-B2

43 P-KB4!

The only move, to realize White's superiority on the $Q$ side. White's Bishop is now transferred to the KR1-QR8 diagonal. Meanwhile White threatens to win with B-Kt4.

Position after White's 43rd move


Otherwise $44 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ follows.
$44 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ $45 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$

This is the point! The QBP is untouchable, as if $45 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; 46 R-B2, B-Q6; $47 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, KKt1; 48 B-B6, R-Q1; 49 R-B1 White, winning back the pawn, has every reason to win the game. Now White transfers the Bishop to Q5, after which the Black QBP is hopelessly weak. Black's next move has as object the transfer of the Bishop to defend QKt2.
45 ... B-K3
46 B-B6
Black replies to $46 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ ch with, of course, not $46 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 47$ P-R6, B-B1; 48 P-R7, B-Kt2; $49 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $50 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, but $46 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ and White has nothing forced in prospect.

| $46 \ldots$ | P-Kt4 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 47 K-B3 | R-KB1 |
| 48 B-Q5 | R-Q1 |
| 49 K-K3 | B-B1 |
| 50 R-R2 | B-Kt2 |

NINETEEN THIRTY-FOUR

## 51 R-Q2 <br> R-K1 ch

It is easy to see that neither now nor earlier could Black exchange at his Q4, as after $51 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 52 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; \quad 53 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ ! his pawn endgame is hopeless.

No better is $51 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and if $52 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$; to force the draw. In this case after 51 ..., P-B4 White follows the simple winning plan of: $52 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, R-K1 ch; $53 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; 54 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $56 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $57 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6!$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 58 R-KR3, and wins.

| 52 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 53 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 54 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 55 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 56 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| 57 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |

An inexact move! As will be seen, he should have given preference to $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$.
57 ...

> B-Q2

58 P-Kt6 ch
Leads to winning a piece.

| $58 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 59 P-R6 | K-Kt1 |

If $59 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$; then $60 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, K-Q1; 61 R-KR7!, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 62 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $63 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 64 R-R8 ch, and White comes out with an extra Rook.

| 60 | R-K7 | K-R2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 61 | B-Kt7 | B-B3 ch |

Exactly! White wins only a minor piece, whereas with the King posted at Kt3 he would now win the Rook with 62 B-B8 dis. ch.
$62 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ dis. ch $\quad \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$
This is of course a won position for White, but it is not without technical difficulties.

Position after Black's 62nd move


White has two plans at his disposal: (1) To keep the Bishop on Kt5, to kill off Black's QKt and QB pawns, and (2) to give Black the possibility of advancing the QKtP (in certain lines) but to keep the Bishop in play. White prefers the second plan.

| 63 | B-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 64 B-Q3 | R-B5 |
| R-B3 |  |

Nothing in $64 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, as there follows 65 P-R4, R-B6; 66 B-Kt6!, P-R4; 67 R-R7, and White saves the RP.

| 65 | B-K2 | K-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 66 K-Kt3 | K-Kt5 |  |
| 67 | R-K3 | R-B5 |

Unquestionably lightens White's task. But even if $67 \ldots, K-R 4$; 68 K-Kt4, R-B5 ch; 69 K-R5, R-R5 ch; 70 K-Kt6, K-Kt5; 71 K-B6, R-B5 ch; 72 K-Kt7, R-R5; 73 K-Kt6, K-R4; 74 B-R5, R $\times$ BP; $75 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; $76 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, White should win.

68 R-K6 K-B6
$69 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
$69 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ could also be played.
69 ...
R-K5
Greater difficulties would arise from 69 ..., R-R5; 70 R-B6, K-Q5; 71 R-Q6 ch, K-B6; 72

R-Q5, K-Kt5; 73 B-B1, R-B5; 74 K-Kt2, R-R5; 75 K-R2!, RB5; $76 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $77 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, R-B5; 78 R-Q6, R-R5; 79 RQB6, R-R4; 80 R-Kt6 ch, K-B6; 81 R-Kt5, K-Q5; 82 R-Kt3!, R-R5; 83 R-KB3, K-K4; 84 R-B8, and even so White wins.

No. 39. Dutch Defence

| M. Yudovich (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-KB4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| 3 P-KKt3 | P-K3 |
| 4 B-Kt2 | B-K2 |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | P-Q4 |
| 6 O-O | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt-B3}$ | P-B3 |
| 8 Q-B2 | Q-K1 |
| 9 B-B4 |  |

Chekhover's move: 9 B-Kt5! seems a stronger one.

| $9 \ldots$ | Q-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 P-Kt3 | QKt-Q2 |
| 11 QR-Q1 | K-R1 |

A well-known variation of the Dutch Defence, in which the play is usually of a closed nature. In this variation Black tries with $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt} 1$ and then $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ to seize the initiative as quickly as possible. However, this leads to a sharpening of the game, which shows that the system is not solid enough.

## 12 K-R1

A loss of tempo; in addition, at R1 the King is not so well placed as at Kt .

| 12 | P-KKt1 | R-KK |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 P-K3 | P-KKt4 |  |
| 14 B-B7! |  |  |

If at once $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$, then $14 \ldots$, P-Kt5.
14 ...
Kt-K1

| 70 B-B1 | R-B5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $71 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | P-R4 |
| 72 R-Kt6 | P-Kt5 |
| 73 P-R4 | K-Q7 |
| 74 R-Kt5 | P-Kt6 |
| $75 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ | R-B7 ch |
| $76 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | R-B5 |
| $77 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | Resigns |

It is necessary to clear up the position, for White planned with $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ to open the QB file.

| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16^{\circ} \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! |  |

Position after White's 17 th move


It would seem that Black was threatened with great danger, as with his next move, P-K4, White opens up the centre, after which his better development and advantage in space should play a decisive part. But it is just here that the insufficiently considered White $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ has its effect, and Black finds a cunning variation with a pawn sacrifice, which gets him happily out of his main difficulties.

| $17 \ldots$ | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 P-K4 | Kt-Q2 |

This is the whole point! White cannot play $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ because of the intermediary move $19 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$. So he is forced to go in for a pawn
capture, which leads to a serious weakening of his position.
19 P-KKt4 Q-K1
Otherwise $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$.

| $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5} 5$ |
| $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{B P}$ | $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

Very risky, as Black is fully compensated for the pawn by the more satisfactory disposition of his pieces ready for a direct attack on the White King, whose Castled position is upset. Simpler is $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; with an approximately equal game.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ | Q-K3 |
| 26 Q-Q2 | B-Q4 |
| 27 R-B1 | R-Kt2 |
| 28 | R-QB2 |

White's situation is serious. Black proceeds to prepare a decisive breakthrough.
29 Q-B1 QR-KKt1
30 P-KR3!
A sharp-witted idea, which even so should not have saved White. Now, in order to break through at $\mathrm{KKt5}$, Black is forced to expose his King, which gives White the possibility of counter-play.

| $30 \ldots$ | P-KR4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | P-Kt5 |
| $32 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | R-R2 |
| $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | P-Kt6 ch |
| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | R $\times$ R ch |
| $36 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Q-KR3 |
| $37 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | B-B3 |

The last move before the timecheck, and, as is often the case, inexact. Black should have played $37 \ldots$... B-K 3 ! and with the threat of B-B4 Black wins.

Position after Black's 37th move


As Black now threatens to play 38 ..., Q-R7; 39 K-B1, B-Kt4 ch; with his next move White defends Kt5.

$$
38 \text { P-QR4 } \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2
$$

Black decides on "wild" complications, as the result of which White could force a draw. Black should have admitted his inexact move at 37 and returned the Bishop to Q4. E.g. $38 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 39 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{KtP} ; 40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 41 Q-B7, P-Kt3; 42 Q-Q8, Q-Kt3; still keeping the advantage.
39 P-Q5
The counter-attack on Black's King should have led to a draw.

| $39 \ldots$ | B-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 R-B7 | Q-R7 |

41 R
Q-R7
41 Q-Kt2
Threatening a deadly discovered check.

| 41 | —. | Q-Kt8 ch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42 B-B1 | Q-K6 ch |  |
| 43 B-K2 | B-K3 |  |

No other defence possible. Of course the Bishop cannot be taken because of $44 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7}$. But White again threatens mate.
44 Q-B2
R-Kt2

Or 44 ..., Q-Kt8 ch; $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, Q-R7; $46 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7} ; 47 \mathrm{Q}-$ KB5!, P-Kt8(Q); 48 Q-B6 ch,

R-Kt2; 49 Q-B8 ch (but not 49 $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ because of $49 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ ) $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2 ; 50 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; 51 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 7, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{K} 5) ; 52 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, K-R3; 53 Q-B8 ch, K-Kt4; 54 Q-Kt8 ch, K-R3; 55 Q-B8 ch, and despite his two Queens Black must reconcile himself to a draw.
$45 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
A mistake that leads to defeat! A draw results from $45 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $46 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! and there is no

No. 40. Queen's Gambit Declined

| M. Botvinnik (White) | I. Kann (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ | P-Q4 |
| 4 Kt -B3 | B-K2 |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | QKt-Q2 |
| 6 P-K3 | O-O |
| $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | R-K1 |
| 8 R -B1 | P-B3 |
| 9 B-B4 | P-KR3 |

An incomprehensible move, to say the least. Black should have played simply 9 . .., P-QR3. Now White clearly outstrips Black in development. Later the weakening of Black's K side also has its effect.

| 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| 12 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$ |
| 13 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 14 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

$14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ is met by $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, P-QB4; $16 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ !, and the Knight at R4 is in a dangerous situation.

## $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ <br> $\mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{K t}$

A positional error. Black now, firstly gets a backward pawn at QB3, secondly yields pawn superiority on the K side to White (the pawn at K 5 !) and most of all, is deprived
defence against $47 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch with perpetual check.
45 ...
Q-B7 ch
$46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
Q-Q5 ch

Now White loses the checking square Q8, and the Black pawn can be queened.
47 K-K1

$$
\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}
$$

White resigns, as after $48 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$, P-Kt7; 49 Q-B8 ch, K-Kt2; 50 Q-B7 ch, K-R3 the Black King escapes from the check.
of the possibility of exploiting the QB file for exchanges. In fact, after $15 \ldots, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ it would be much more difficult for White to organize an attack on the Black King.

## 16 B-Kt1

Drawing the Black Knight away from QB5.

| $16 \ldots$ | Kt-B1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 O-O | Q-Kt3 |
| 18 Q-B2 | KR-QB1 |
| 19 B-K3 | P-QR4 |

Position after Black's 19th move


Black is completely helpless and undertakes a desperate attempt at counter-attack. White could reply simply $20 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ (20 ..., P-Kt5; $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ), retaining all the advantages of the position. But he rightly assumes that the time has already
arrived for decisive action, and so he takes no notice of Black's counter operations.
20 Q-KB5 P-QKt5
21 Q-Kt4
This is an unnecessary waste of time. He should have played 21 $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{P}!$ and $21 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ is out of the question because of $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6!, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 23 Q-Kt4 ch, K-B2; 24 Q-R5 ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; $26 \mathrm{Q}-$ B7 ch, K-R1; 27 B-R7!! and mate is inevitable.

After White's mistake Black succeeds in tying up the game on the $Q$ side, and his pieces get freedom of action.

| $21 \ldots$ | P-QB4 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | B-B5 | R-B3 |

Perhaps $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is preferable.

| $23 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |$\quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ B-B


| 24 | P-R4! |
| :---: | :---: |
| 25 Q-R4 |  |
| Nothing in 25 Q-Q1, |  |
| $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B},$ and $28 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$. |  |
| 25 | Kt-Kt3 |
| $26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

White decides on a piece sacrifice, but this too proves inadequate for a win.

| $26 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |

White has brilliant play after $28 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, K-B1; $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1!$ ! and there is no defence against $32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! (31 ..., Q-Q1; $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}$, or $31 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2)$.
$29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$
$30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$

Even so it would have been better to play $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 32 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ ! ; $33 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; although here too it is difficult for White to exploit his extra pawn.

Position after White's 28th move


| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $31 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| $32 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |
| $33 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| $34 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| $35 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| $36 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $37 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| $38 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| $39 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |  |

The last attempt. 40 Q-Kt5, P-Kt6 also only leads to a draw.

| $40 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $41 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $42 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ |
| $44 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |

Not 45 ..., P-Kt7, after 46 PKt6, P-Kt8(Q); 47 Q-Q8 ch, QKt 1 ; 48 Q-R4 ch, leads to mate.
46 Q-Q7
47 Q-R3 ch
48 Q 36 ch
K-Kt3

Drawn by agreement.

## NINETEEN THIRTY-FIVE

One result of my two successful performances, in the match with Flohr and the tournament in which Euwe participated, was that I was invited to take part in the traditional Christmas tournament at Hastings.

I arrived in Hastings only two hours before the tournament began-a mistake which I have never committed again. At first I went down easily enough before Euwe and Thomas, and as the tournament was only of short duration this determined my failure. Certain people in the West tried to draw "profound" conclusions from this result, but these views could not have held the field for more than a month or two, i.e. down to the Second Moscow International Tournament.

There was very strong competition to be faced in this tournament: besides the finest Soviet masters, Lasker, Capablanca, Flohr, Spielmann and several other international masters took part in it. In the end the contest developed into a struggle between Flohr and me. Flohr was successful against the Soviet competitors, while I was successful against the foreign visitors (I lost twice to Soviet masters). In the end Flohr and I shared first and second prizes. The third was Emanuel Lasker, then 67 years old, half a point behind; he went right through the tournament without one defeat.

For my success in this tournament I was awarded the title of U.S.S.R. Grand Master.

In 1935 the youthful Soviet chess school finally won world recognition.
For combining chess so well with my post-graduate work as an engineer Gregory Konstantinovich Ordzonokidze ${ }^{1}$ presented me with a car.

## MOSCOW INTERNATIONAL TOURNAMENT February

| No. 41. Caro-Kann Defence <br> (by transposition) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| M. Botvinnik <br> (White) | R. Spielmann (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-QB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $3 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 4 P-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | Kt-B3 |
| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | Q-Kt3 |

Recommended by the Czech master G. Reifir. I knew of $6 \ldots$, Q-Kt3 before this game took place, and had had the opportunity to analyse the resulting position thoroughly.
I spent altogether twenty minutes
in considering the whole game, and that only in order to check my home analysis. Reifir's move is unsatisfactory chiefly because instead of developing his pieces Black tries to launch an attack with Queen alone.

$$
7 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{Q} \times K t \mathbf{P}
$$

Also unsatisfactory are $7 \ldots$, $\mathrm{KKt} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 8 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \quad \mathrm{ch}$; $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; and $7 \ldots, \mathrm{QKt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $8 \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ !, $\mathrm{Kt} \times$ Kt ; $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

## 8 R-B1

Black had not foreseen this reply. Probably Spielmann expected White to play to win a piece as in a variation previously published: 8 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$;
$10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, QKt 5 ch ; $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! but it is easy to see that White will be subjected to attack. Now the Black Knight at B3 has four ways of retreat, but, alas, they all lose:
(1) $8 \ldots$, QKt-Kt1; $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, Q-Kt5 ch; $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$.

Position after White's 8th move

No. 42. Grünfeld Defence
C. Capablanca $\quad$ M. Botvinnik
(White)
(Black)

| 1 | P-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-KKt3 |
| 3 | Kt-QB3 | P-Q4 |

In the Hastings Christmas tournament of 1934 Capablanca played unconvincingly against Flohr's Grünfeld Defence. So I too adopted the Grünfeld Defence against him.

## 4 Kt-B3

Unquestionably the system which gives White most initiative here is the one associated with $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ (at the fourth or fifth move).

| $4 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times P}{ }$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 Q-Kt3 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

6 Q-Kt3
In this position $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ is no danger to Black, as he develops strong pressure on the centre squares.

$\begin{array}{ll}6 \ldots & \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \\ 7 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}}{ } & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4\end{array}$
(2) $8 \ldots$, QKt-R4; 9 Q-R4 ch.
(3) $8 \quad \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{B}$; 10 B-Kt5 ch, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 11 R-B2, Q-Kt5; 12 Q-K2 ch!, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{Q}-$ Kt 4 ch , etc.
Thus he is left with only the fourth way of retreat:
8 ...
QKt-Kt5
$9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$
The Black Queen is caught, and she can be saved only by sacrificing a piece.

| 9 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times$ RP |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | B-QB4 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 11 | Kt-KB3 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

$12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
Black resigns. $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ is followed by $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and he is forced to give up the Knight with 13 ..., Kt-B7 ch.

| 8 P-K3 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 B-K2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Black plans to fianchetto the Queen's Bishop, but meanwhile he is subjected to a strong attack with P-QR4-5. The plan he has chosen is sound only in conjunction with $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, where it prevents $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 5$. So the play was correct in the Goglidze-Botvinnik game (No. 46 infra) which went: $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$; 10 O-O, P-Kt3; 11 P-QR4, Kt-B3. and Black has an excellent game. 10 O-O

Q-B2

## 11 P-QR4

White has in mind after P-R5, B-R3 and KR-Kt1 to exert prolonged pressure on the Q side. To prevent this, Black agrees to the isolation of his QRP, hoping that his superior development and longrange Bishops are sufficient compensation.

| 11. | P-Kt3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12 P-R5 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| 13 Q-R3 | B-Kt2 |

$14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$
KR-B1
$15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$

After any other move Black would still continue $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, attacking the White centre.
15 ...
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$
$\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{QP}$
17 R-Q1 $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{QP}$

An exactly calculated drawing manœuvre. In making this move Black had to foresee the closing position.
$18 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$
QR-QB1

Position after Black's 18th move


The entire manœuvre is based on the fact that the White QB has no good square to retire to. E.g.:

## No. 43. Ruy Lopez

| P. Romanovsky | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| $4 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |  |

Formerly this exchange variation was played with the intention after $4 \ldots, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}$; $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 6 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 7 \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ of exploiting in the endgame pawn superiority ( 4 pawns to 3 ) on the $K$ side. However, as time passed it transpired that Black's two Bishops offset this disadvantage.
$19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ !; $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; and Black, with $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ at his disposal, has at least an equal game.
$19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$ !
A cunning trap: White counts on $19 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$; $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ !, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; 23 K-K2 winning a pawn. However, Black has foreseen a different continuation.

| $19 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |

A draw is obvious also after $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$.

| 21 | O | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 22 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |

If Black tried to play for a win, after $24 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$; 26 P-B4, P-B3; $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; 28 B-Q6, R-Q2; 29 B-Kt8, R-Kt2; 30 B-Q6 the game would still be drawn.

In 1928 P. Romanovsky published an analysis in which he put forward the system of development now played in this game. White refrains from the Queen exchange and, later, according to circumstances, prepares a break through at KB4 or Q4.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |

To prevent 8 P-Q4.
$8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
In order to play $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ and 10 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$, also having in mind $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ and P-Q4.
$8 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

## $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

It transpires that it is not easy for White to prepare $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, as $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is met by $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$. If further 10 O-O, O-O; $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-$ QKt3; 12 K-R1, Q-K2; 13 P-KB4 (as in the Tartakower-Alekhine game, Semmering, 1926), 13 . . ., P-KB4!; $14 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; and Black has the better game.
$9 \ldots$
$10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$
$12 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 13 \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$,
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ at once is doubtful,
because of $14 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QB} 5$.
$12 \ldots$
Decisively preventing the break-
through of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

Position after Black's 12th move


A second system: $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1$; $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ leads to approximately the same variations as could arise later in the game itself (see moves 35-37). But probably, after $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ White's best is $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.
$13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
14 QR-Q1 P-QKt3

If this is followed by $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$, then $15 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$;
$17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ !

## 15 P-B3 <br> B-K2

Black had already planned the advance of the KBP, but he has to find the right moment. E.g. it is impossible to play straightforwardly 15 ..., Kt-K2; 16 KR-K1, P-B4; $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 19 Kt-K4, and Black's Bishops have only imperceptible superiority. Black should play P-KB4 only when White cannot exchange Knights at KB5 with advantage.

| $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

If now or on the previous move White played $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ ! would follow to Black's clear advantage.
18 Q-B2

$$
\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2
$$

19 R-Q2 P-KB4!

It is useful now to make certain deductions with regard to the opening system White has chosen. White's basic idea (the break-through at Q4 and KB4) has not been realized. In the future also White is continually forced to pursue waiting tactics.
Black has the initiative, but it is not easy for him to find a sound plan.

Position after Black's 19th move


Black's move 19 looks rather risky, as the KP is weakened and White gets K4. But in reality Black can avoid the weakness at his K4 (by transferring the Knight to KB5, where White will have to exchange
t) while the K4 square is far from Black's camp, and its occupation by White is more than offset by the opening of the KB file and Black's freer position.

| $20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| 22 Q-K1 | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

Tactically unsound; it would have been better to keep the Bishop at Q3 and double the Rooks on the KB file, preparing a pawn attack on the K side. After the text move Black has to lose time defending his KP. Now White manœuvres skilfully, gradually intensifying the pressure on this pawn

| 23 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 26 | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

Of course $26 \ldots, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R P}$ is impossible, because of $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$.
27 Q-B2 Q-B2
Black could continue 27
P-B5; $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; eliminating the doubled pawn and undermining the Knight at K4. But in that case the exchange of major pieces on the Q file would predetermine a draw.

| 28 R-Q2 | R-K3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 QR-K2 | R(Q)-K1 |
| 30 Q-R4 |  |

White still plays a waiting game, gradually posting his pieces in the most favourable manner for an attack on Black's KP

## 30 ... <br> $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

Black decides that to eliminate White's pressure on the KP he must transfer the Knight to KB5.

| 31 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ |

To defend the K4 pawn and to prepare for play on the K side.
$34 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Q} 2$
B-Kt2
$35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 1$
$35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ is better. The Black KP is clearly weak, and Black would be forced to play $35 \ldots$, Kt-B5. But then after $36 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{B}$; $37 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ! (to exchange the Rooks) approximate equality is reached-a natural result after Black's inexact play at move 22 .
35 ...
36 R-Q2
R(3)-K2
R-Q2
$37 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$
Position after White's 37th move


Carelessness. He should have played 37 P-QR3, after which, if he played soundly, the game would have been generally of the same nature as after $35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ (see the preceding note). But now White loses a pawn.

| $37 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ |

39 P
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}$
39 P-R4
The right move here is $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ P-R5!; $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ (the Queen is not caught: $40 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $41 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $R \times P ; 42 R \times R, K P \times R ; 43 R-R 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ ! leads to White's loss), $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$; $14 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; $42 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ ( $43 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 44 K-R2, B-Q5; $45 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ ), Q-R1, and White can count on a draw
$39 \ldots$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$40 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$

NINETEEN THIRTY-FIVE

| 41 | R(Q)-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 42 | B-Kt3 |

Preventing $43 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ and beginning the attack along the KKt file. 43 K-B2

Weak, as here the King occupies a highly insecure position. But even with the better move $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$, P-R4 (not, of course, $43 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, because of $44 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ !, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 45 R-KKt4); 44 B-R2, R(B)-Q1! 45 R-KB1 (otherwise $45 \ldots$, B-R3 46 R-K1, R $\times$ QP; $47 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $48 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 6!$ ), P-B5!; $46 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, B-R3!; 47 R-K2, R-Q7! and Black wins.
43 ... P-R4
The beginning of the decisive attack.
$44 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
To meet the threat of $44 \ldots$, B-R3.

| $44 \ldots$ | B-R3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | R-Kt2 |
| $46 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| $47 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}!$ |

Position after Black's 47th move


No. 44. Queen's Gambit Accepted

| M. Botvinnik (White) | G. Levenfish (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-KB3 |
| 4 Q-R4 ch |  |

Leads swiftly to the goal. $48 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ is followed by $48 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ (or $49 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 \mathrm{ch}$; $50 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R}-$ Kt5 ch; $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; mate), $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch; $50 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Kt8}$; mate.
48 K-Kt1 $\quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$
$49 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$
Or $49 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ with exchange of Queens.

| $49 \ldots$ | Q-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $50 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| $51 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 52 Q-Kt3 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

$53 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$
$53 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ is followed by $53 \ldots$, Q-B2!

| 53 | $\ldots$ | Q-B6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 54 | P-Kt3 | Q $\times$ P |
| 55 | Q-K6 | B-R3 |
| 56 | Q-R3 | R-B2 |

$57 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K}$
White's last hope is $57 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $58 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ ! which, however, would not have saved the game, if only because of the counter-blow $58 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ ch!; $59 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; 60 Q-Kt2, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $61 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$, B-B8; $62 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $63 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-R5; 64 Kt-B6 ch, K-R1; 65 Kt-Q5, P-B4.

| $57 \ldots$ | Q-Kt8 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 58 Kt-B1 | Q-B4 |
| 59 Q-R2 | P-R5 |

Exchanges at KB2 are inevitable, followed by B-B8, and B $\times$ KtP.

White resigns.
Bogoljubov continued thus in one of the games of his second match with Alekhine for the world championship. It is doubtful if the move is any stronger than $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$, but at that time it had the advantage of being a comparative innovation.
4 ...
P-QB3

And this was Alekhine's defence in the same game. Here the more natural move (as Lasker played in his game with me during the same tournament) is $4 \ldots, \mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$, as in analogous variations of the Catalan Opening.

| $5 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |
| 7 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |

Not a bad move. It is very useful to exchange off White's QKt, making it more difficult for him to prepare $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, while Black can play $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 5$, forcing further exchanges.
$8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$
Kt-Q3
Inexpedient. The right move is $8 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; 10 Q-Kt3, B-K5; 11 Kt-K5, B-Q4; $12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, with equal game.

## 9 Q-R4

This manœuvre seems rather strange, but it is necessary: if 9 QKt3, Q-Kt3! White's Queen is driven just the same into $10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$.
9 ...
Kt-Kt3
Black must play very resourcefully, otherwise $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ followed by P-K4.
10 Q-Q1
Q-B1
$11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

After 11 P-KR3 White would have greai viiniculty in Castling.
11 ...

## B-KR6

Black estimates the position unsoundly. $10 \ldots$, Q-B1 could have an exceptionally prophylactic value: it would take the sting out of 11 Kt-R4, because Black would now have the reply: $11 \ldots, B-R 6$ ! In the given position there is no justification for linking up an attack on the White King with $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ (in such cases it is often useful to exchange off the fianchettoedBishop).

The Queen's Bishop should have been kept as long as possible at B4, to delay White's P-K4. With the sound reply $11 \ldots$ P-KKt3!; $12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, B-R6! (12 ..., B-Kt2; 13 P-K4, B-R6; $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}) ; 13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ Black retains chances of equal play.
12 P-K4
$B \times B$
$12 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ is bad because of $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 3)-$ B1; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt5}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 16 \mathrm{P}-$ KKt4, Q-Q2; 17 Q-B3, P-K3; $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$.
$13 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}$
P-K3
Position after Black's 13th move


Now Black gets into a difficult situation. It would have been better to play $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$, and there would probably have followed 14 P-QR4, P-QR4; 15 B-Kt5, B-Kt2; 16 Q-B1 (White has every reason to make such a manœuvre, as he dominates the centre and is better developed).

## 14 P-Q5! B-K2

A crucial decision. If $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$, then $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 16$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} ; 17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3(17 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, and $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ); $18 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathrm{ch}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 19 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$. Black loses a pawn without adequate compensation; so he allows the formation of the defended passed
pawn on Q6, hoping that his closed position will be difficult to break through.

## 15 P-K5 <br> Kt-Kt4

Or $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B4; 16 P-Q6, B-Q1; 17 P-KKt4.
16 P-Q6
$16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ is hardly stronger, as in this case the remaining Black Knight could be established excellently at Q4.

## $16 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

After $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is forced, as if $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ the threat $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ would completely disorganize the Black forces.

| $17 \mathrm{P} \times$ Kt | B-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Q-Q4 |
| 19 | Q-KKt4 |
| P-QB4 |  |
| R-KKt1 |  |

The only move. If $19 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; then $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6$, and if $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ White replies $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ or $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$.

## 20 Q-K4

Nothing is gained by $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, because of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 22 Q-KR4, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 23 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ (or $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KBP}, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{B} 1 ; 25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$ ch, R-Q2; 26 Q-KKt4, P-KR4; 27 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{KB} 2$; and White loses a piece), $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, and Black has a very promising game.

| $20 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |
| Still forestalling | $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$. |
| $21 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |

$22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ would be met by $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, with a winning endgame.

## 23 Q-QR4

Not now $23 \mathrm{P} \times$ BP e.p. because of $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 \mathrm{ch}$; $25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.
$\begin{array}{ll}23 \ldots & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{KB} 2 \\ 24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3\end{array}$
$25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$
25 K-Kt1
25 P-B4 leads only to an interchange of moves after $25 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-$ QKt4; 26 Q-B2 (26 P $\times$ P, QKt2 ch), Q-B3 ch; $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$, and then as in the text.
25 ...
P-QKt4
26 Q-B2
Q-B3
$26 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ would be met by $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $28 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $29 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$; $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$, and it is much easier for White to break through.
27 P-B4
R-KB1
Position after Black's 27th move


An interesting position has been reached. From the 14th move onward Black, in a dangerous position, has defended himself excellently, and now, because of the closed nature of the position, he is justified in counting on a draw. He should have tried to close the game on the $Q$ side, while retaining the utmost mobility for his pieces, which is necessary in order to repel White's break-through on the K side. His right move here is: 27 ..., P-Kt5!; $28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ (28 P-QR3, P-QR4; $29 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$; or $29 \ldots, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}), \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ !

But now, with 28 P-QR4, P-Kt5; 29 P-R5 White could finally smother the black Bishop and work at once
to achieve a break-through on the K side.

| $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | P-Kt5! |
| :---: | :---: |
| After 28 | B-Kt3; $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, |
| $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 30$ pawn. | Kt-Q4, White wins a |
| 29 P-QR3 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

Despite Black's shortcomings in the preceding phase, this is his first decisive blunder. Opening a file on the Q side leads to the loss of a pawn. He should have played $29 \ldots$, P-QR4!; $30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 31 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2(32 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$, B-Kt3; 33 Q-B2, Q-R2!), B-Kt3; 33 R-R1, Q-B3; and one cannot see how White can improve his position.
$30 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$
P-QR4
Black has no defence against 31 $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{KB})-\mathrm{R} 1$ followed by $32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$.
31 Q-KKt2

| No. 45. Ruy Lopez |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N. Riumin (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-QB3 |
| 3 | B-Kt5 | P-QR3 |
| 4 | B-R4 | Kt-B3 |
| 5 | O-O | B-K2 |
| 6 | Q-K2 |  |

The usual continuation is $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$. The text move is intended to combine $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ with $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, which intensifies the pressure on Black's KP.

| 6 | $\ldots$ | P-QKt4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 B-Kt3 | P-Q3 |  |
| 8 P-QB3 | O-O |  |
| 9 P-Q4 |  |  |

White goes straight ahead with his plan, which is not justified by the position. Theory considers the sound move here to be $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ ! and Black still has several awkward opening problems.

The simplest! It forces an endgame which is hopeless for Black.

| $31 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $32 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| $32 \ldots$, | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 ;$ |
| $33 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{KB})$ |  |
| is not much better. But no |  |
| Queen's Bishop remains shut |  |
| $33 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| $35 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $36 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 1)-\mathrm{QR} 1$ |  |

The pawn is lost just the same.

| $36 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37 | $\mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $39 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 40 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8$ |
| 41 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 42 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
|  | Resigns |

Black cannot prevent the White King's march to QB6.

| $9 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $10 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

As is well known, the centre pawns are strongest when side by side, but in the given position this circumstance is not of great importance, as with the manœuvre that follows Black obtains control of the strong central squares.

## $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ <br> P-Q4!

12 P-K5
$12 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ with equal play is worth considering.

| $12 \ldots$ | Kt-K5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 P-KR3 | B-R4 |
| 14 P-QR4 |  |

This now is simply bad. White should have played to exchange the Knight at K5. But $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times$ Kt ; $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ (or $15 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-$ Kt3, associated with Kt-R4) gives Black rather the better game (as in Réti-Stoltz, Stockholm, 1928).

[^2]Position after Black's 13th move


Very strong! Black has deprived White's Knight of QB3, and he cannot play $15 \mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, as the QP is left hanging. On the other hand White has an unsatisfactory game after 15 B-B2, P-KB4; $16 \mathrm{P} \times$ P e.p., $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ !
Nor will White be able to defend the pawn with $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, because of 15 ..., Kt-R4; 16 B-B2, P-KB4; and the K5 Knight is safely consolidated.

Finally, with 15 P-Kt4 White would not win a tempo, as Black would still not withdraw his King to R1, but would continue 15
B-Kt3; 16 Kt-R2, Kt-R4!; 17 BB2, P-KB4 with a still stronger position than in the text, as now the Q4 pawn is not under threat.

## $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 5$

It is necessary to deprive the Knight of square QR4.
15 ...
K-R1

16 P-Kt4
Understandably, this is not an attacking but a defensive move. Otherwise, with $16 \ldots$, P-KB4 Black would obtain a decisive superiority in the centre and on the K side. However, 16 Q-B2 also would not bring any relief; it is met by the simple $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ (not $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4)$ and

White's pieces would become even more inchoate.
$16 \ldots$
B-Kt3
$17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$
B-R5

Black is already contemplating B-Kt6.

| 18 B-K3 | P-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 | P-B4 |

Position after Black's 19th move


It was not easy to decide on this manœuvre; in the moves which follow the Bishop is more than once in danger, a circumstance which compelled Black to calculate the possibilities very exactly.
There is now a threat of $20 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ with an attack on the KBP; if White defends with his Rook, 20 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$, then $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}!$ !; $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$; 24 Q-K3, P-B4; 25 Kt-KB3, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 27 \mathrm{Kt}-$ $\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$; and Black wins without difficulty. That is why White is forced to play $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$.
$20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$
Opening the KKt file for a decisive attack and for defence of the Bishop at Kt6, under cover of which Black will concentrate his forces.
$\begin{array}{ll}21 & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\ 22 & \mathbf{K t}-\mathbf{Q} 2\end{array} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$,
The most difficult moment in the game. To ensure a successful attack Black must post his Bishop at KR4.

This can be achieved only with the Queen's co-operation. But the Queen is burdened by defence of the QP; hence arises the necessity to defend the pawn with the Knight.

In addition, Black parries White's threat to exchange at K4, e.g.: $23 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 26 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! or $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$; $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ (at White's Kt3), B-R4!; $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, Kt-B4; 27 Q-B2, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; 29 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt6}$, and there can be no doubt about the result.

| 23 | K-R1 | Q-K1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | R-KKt1 | B-R4 |
| 25 | Kt(R2)-B3 | R-KKt1 |
| 26 | Kt-B1 |  |

White is forced to separate his Rooks, as if he attempts to intensify the attack on the Kt6 Bishop with 26 R-KKt2 it is met by $26 \ldots$, B-B7! (with threat of $27 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ ch); $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

| 26 | $\ldots$ | Q-B2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | B-Q1 | R-Kt2 |
| 28 | R-B1 | P-B3 |
| 29 | R-B2 | R(R)-KKt1 |

Both sides are in extreme timetrouble; this explains why neither now nor later does Black play $\mathrm{P}_{-}$ QKt6! forcing the Rook to retreat. However, this does not affect the issue.

No. 46. Grünfeld Defence
V. Goglidze
(White)
M. Botvinnik
(Black)

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 5 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |  |

The Capablanca-Botvinnik game

## 30 R-Kt2

White has no satisfactory defence against the threats of $30 \ldots, B \times B P$ ! and $30 \ldots, B-B 7$ !

Position after White's 30th move

$30 \ldots$
B $\times \mathbf{P}$
$31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$
Or $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 32 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$; and $33 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 8$ mate. If $31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, then $31 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $32 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ (or $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ), $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$; and White is in a hopeless position.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |  |
| $33 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ |  |
| $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |  |
| $35 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathbf{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |  |
| $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$ |  |
|  | Resigns |  |

This game was awarded a brilliancy prize.
(No. 42 supra) developed in the same manner.

This system causes Black no difficulties whatever. White's threats on the Q side in connection with the open Kt file are repulsed easily.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
6 \ldots & \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \\
7 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}}{ } & \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}
\end{array}
$$

In the Capablanca-Botvinnik game Black played 7 ..., P-QB4! which is undoubtedly more exact, as
now White could hinder P-QB4 by 8 B-R3.
8 P-K3 9 P-QB4

9 B-K2
Here 9 B-R3 no longer has its former force, because of $9 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 10 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and White has to take defensive measures against $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}$.
$9 \ldots \quad$ Q-B2
10 O-O P-Kt3
Position after Black's 10th move


This move fundamentally improves the whole variation in Black's favour. In the Capablanca-Botvinnik game Black played $10 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, to which White replied $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ ! and obtained a prolonged initiative. But now, as the present game shows, a diversion with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ is entirely without force, as Black will be able to control his QR4. White should have continued $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ and then P-QB4, to exchange off Black's fianchettoed Bishop.

| 11 | P-QR4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 Q-R3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |  |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |  |

White wants to drive the Knight off R4, and succeeds.

## 13

## B-Kt2

Other possible continuations: 13
$\ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $14 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4 ; 15$

Kt-B3! or $13 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$; 14 B-Kt2, KR-Q1; 15 QR-B1, lead to approximately equal play.
$14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$15 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$
The simplest. Inferior is $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6!$; $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 17 B-Kt2, Q-B3; 18 P-K4!, KRQ1; and Black would seize the initiative.

## 15 ... <br> Kt-B5

Nothing would come of attempting to isolate White's QP, as after $15 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ White saves himself with $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$.
16 Q-Kt4
KR-B1

17 P-R5
Just in time. White frees himself from his one weakness, the QR4 pawn and, despite some backwardness in development, can fully count on a draw.

$$
17 \ldots \quad \text { P-K4 }
$$

With the obvious intention of increasing the activity of his King's Bishop.

## $18 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$

This move makes White's task much more difficult. The only correct course is immediate simplification: $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 19$ $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} ; \quad 20 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ (20 ..., R-B6; $21 \mathrm{Kt-B5}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 22 B-Kt2! or $20 \ldots$, R-Kt5; 21 Kt-B5, $\quad \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{ch}$; $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3)$; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} ; 22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QB} 3$; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! with a probable draw. Now Black avoids exchanges.

## 18 . <br> $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t P}$ !

19 Kt -R5
White could avoid an isolated QP by playing: $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; 20 Q-R5, Kt-B6; $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (21 B-R6, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Kt1}), \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B}-$ QB3; but then Black with his two

Bishops would retain some superiority.
$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ is no better, because of $19 \ldots$, B-QB3; $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ;$ and $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
19 ... B-Q4
$20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}+2$
Leads to an almost forced lose. But even the better 20 B-R6, R-Q1; $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K}$ 2 (or $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 22$ $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3), \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 5$ ! (and possibly $24 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ) is also clearly in Black's favour.
20 ...
B-B1

21 Q-Kt5
Or 21 Q-Q2 (21 Q-K1 also is met by $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ), Q-B7; $22 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5} ; 24 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 7)-$ Q1, R-B7.

| $21 \dddot{O}$ | P-QR3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 Q-Q3 | P-K5 |
| 23 Q-Kt1 |  |

To 23 Q-Q1 the strongest reply would seem to be $23 \ldots$, B-Kt5!; 24 R-B1 (forestalling $24 \ldots$, Q-B7), Q-Q2 leaving Black in a dominating position.


No salvation! If $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ ( $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $27 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, B-Kt5), QR-QKt1 Black wins easily. The continuation White chooses allows Black to end the game brilliantly.

| 24 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $28 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}!$ |
| $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ |  |

And mate next move.

## NINETEEN THIRTY-SIX

In the spring of 1936 a chess event of the first importance took place in Moscow. This was the Third Moscow International Tournament, a doubleround contest.

Capablanca was in brilliant form. After I lost to him at the very beginning (and lost unnecessarily! But for obvious blunders during the fifth hour of play this game would probably have been my best in the tournament) he kept the lead to the end.

My struggle with Capablanca for the first prize in this tournament made such a strong impression on some Soviet masters that before the Nottingham Tournament of August, the same year, where all the finest players of the world were gathered, Ilyin-Zhenevsky expressed the opinion that the most likely winners were Capablanca and myself.

NINETEEN THIRTY-SIX
He proved correct. True, at the beginning of the contest Capablanca went down to Flohr, and Euwe seemed to be my most dangerous rival. But after Euwe's defeat by Alekhine, Capablanca again went ahead, and he and I shared first place.
I should mention that I arrived in Nottingham ten days before the tournament began, and not two hours before, as at Hastings.

Nottingham marked the first success of a Soviet master outside his own country. In recognition of this success the Soviet Government awarded me the order of "The Badge of Honour."

## INTERNATIONAL TOURNAMENT AT MOSCOW

## May

No. 47. Réti Opening

|  | M. Botvinnik | A. Lilienthal <br> (White) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | (Black) |  |

The attempt to avoid the Bishop exchange by playing $7 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ would lead to White's disadvantage because of $7 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $8 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$; and the QBP is noticeably weak.

| $7 \ldots$ | $B \times B$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \underset{\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{B}}{ }$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |

Inexact, and creating difficulties for Black. The usual continuation 8 ..., Q-B1; 9 P-Kt3, Q-Kt2 ch; $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ gives him an approximately equal game.
9 Kt -B3
O-O
A second, even more serious piece of inexact play. He should still have played $9 \ldots, \dot{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ as the need to defend the QBP diverts White from operations in the centre.
$\begin{array}{ll}10 & \text { P-K4 } \\ 11 & \text { B-K3 }\end{array} \quad$ Qt-B3

No better is $11 \ldots$ Kt-KKt5; $12 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $13 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$.

| 12 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | KR-Q1 |
| 14 | R-B1 | QR-B1 |
| 15 | Q-Q2 | P-QR3 |

Position after Black's 15 th move


White has achieved considerable positional superiority. Black is cramped and so is forced to attempt to break free. To this end he prepares to advance $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$. The alternative plan, to free himself by P-Q4 would swiftly lead to disaster after $15 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $16 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 17 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$.
16 KR-Q1 Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}$
Not at once $16 \ldots$, P-QKt4 because of $17 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 18$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, winning a pawn.
$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
P-Q3

Necessary, as the immediate 17 ., $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} t 4$ is followed by $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ (with threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ) and Black is left at least with a weak and isolated QP.

So Black first defends the KP, but in doing so gives White time to prevent $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$.

| $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

Defending the KtP. Not $19 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} t 4$ because of $20 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; 21 P-R5.
$20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$
21 P-R4
If Black plays $21 \ldots$, P-KR4 it weakens the $K$ side considerably. Nor can he transfer the Knight to the centre, for then White plays P-R5.

```
21 \ldots % R R-K1
22 R-B3
23 Q-Q4
```

Position after White's 23rd move

23.

P-QKt4
The attempt to get freedom only hastens the denouement: with a passive defence Black could still put up prolonged resistance, as it is not easy for White to organize an attack
on the King. The game could go approximately as follows: $23 \ldots$, Kt -B3; $24 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 1)-\mathrm{QB} 1$ (preventing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$. Not good is $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4), \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (nothing better in sight); $25 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, R-B4; 26 P-QKt4, R-B2; 27 P-R5, and the attack swings over to the K side.

| 24 | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Black has no defence against the Rȯok's irruption into his second rank.
27 R-B7
Q-Kt4
$28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ !

The simplest. After $28 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP} \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $29 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; White still has to neutralize the passed pawn.

| $28 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| $30 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

Not $30 \ldots$, R-R1 because of $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$, and $32 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch. The endgane is won very easily. Black will have to surrender a piece for the passed pawn.

| $31 \mathrm{Kt-Kt6}$ | Kt-B3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $32 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR5}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Kt-K1 |
| 35 P-R6 | Kt-B2 |
| 36 P-R7 | Kt-R1 |
| $37 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | K-B1 |
| $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | K-K2 |
| $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | P-B3 |
| $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | P-R3 |
| $41 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-B2 |
| $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | K-Kt2 |
| $43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-B2 |
| 44 K-B5 | Resigns |

This game was awarded the first brilliancy prize.

## No. 48. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik | I. Kann |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

Premature. Correct is $5 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ at once.

## 6 B-Kt5

R-K1
It would be bad for Black now to play to win a pawn by $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$; e.g. 7. B-R4, P-KKt4; 8 B-Kt3, P-Kt5; $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, and Black's K side is very weak.
7 P-K3
7 P-K4 might be followed by 7 ..., P-K4; 8 P-Q5, Kt-Q5; 9 Q-Q3, P-B4; and Black has control of his Q5.

| $7 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| $9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

The Knight must be destroyed, or $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ will follow.
$10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$
The pin of the Knight restricts all Black's game, and to get rid of this pin he is forced to weaken his K side perceptibly.
A variation favourable to White follows $10 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; to which the reply would be: $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt} ; 12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathbf{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and Black could not take the QBP because of 16 Q-Kt4 ch, K-R1; 17 R-Q1, and 18 R-Q7.

## 11 B-R4 Q-K2

It would be better to play at once 11 ..., P-KKt4; 12 B-Kt3, KtKR4; exchanging off the unpleasant Bishop at KKt3. Now White could avert this exchange by $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$.

12 QR-K1 B-Q2
Another passive move! Here too he should have played $12 \ldots$, P-KKt4 followed by Kt-KR4.

## $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

Preventing $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-KR4 and also preparing $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$, after which it will be very difficult for Black to get free of the pin.

| 13 | $\ldots$ | P-KKt4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | B-Kt3 | K-Kt2 |
| 15 | P-B4 | P-K5 |

16 P-KR3
To prevent $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt} 5$.
$16 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$
16 ..., Kt-KKt1 should have been preferred. White cannot now play $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$ because of $17 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, so a preliminary exchange of pawns is necessary.

$$
17 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

Position after Black's 17th move


White has gained considerable positional superiority; however, it would have been far from simple to exploit it if Black had played 17 ..., $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}(18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4, \mathrm{Kt}$-R2; 19 $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5)$. Instead, Black loses a pawn with no compensation whateiver.
$18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$
Or $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, Q-K2; $20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.
$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Bad is $19 \ldots, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{K} 2)(20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $21 \mathrm{P}-$ Kt3; or $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$; $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 5$ ); $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ (22 ..., Kt-K4; $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ ); $23 \mathrm{~B}-$ Q4 ch, K-Kt3; 24 P-Kt4, and there is no defence against $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$.

| $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

With an extra pawn and unceasing initiative White has every chance of winning.

| 22 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 24 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |  |
| 27 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{K})-\mathrm{QKt}$ |
| 30 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |  |

Simpler is $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{QP}, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, winning the exchange.

## $30 \ldots \quad$ P-Kt5

Black has innproved the position of his pieces, but alas, at the cost of three pawns. The attempt to complicate the same when at such a

No. 49. Alekhine's Defence

| M. Botvinnik | S. Flohr |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |

Here theory recommends 5 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$. Flohr, intentionally, avoids the well-known variations.
Later it was proved that $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ ! ensures White the better game.

## 6 O-O

$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
material disadvantage cannot alter the outcome. White's win is only a question of time.
$31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$
R-Kt7
$32 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{QP}$
B-B3

This loses at once, but even after the relatively better reply $32 \ldots$, Q-Kt4 Black's attack is swiftly liquidated. E.g. $33 \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R} 4, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$; $34 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}(34 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$; $35 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $36 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; 37 R-B2); 35 Q-R7, R-Q1 (35 ..., P-Kt6; $36 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 37 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ); $36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$; $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$.


Black, in time-trouble, overlooks the loss of the Rook. But in any case his game is now hopeless.

| $37 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $38 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $39 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

Black resigned without waiting for White's reply.

These exchanges lead to a loss of two tempi for Black, after which White has an obviously superior position. The correct continuation here is $6 \ldots, B \times K t ; 7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$.

| $7 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

10 P-B4
The following piece sacrifice is unsound: $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 11 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt3;} 12 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ double ch, K-Q2!
$10 \ldots$
$\mathbf{K t}(\mathbf{Q} 4)-K t 3$

| 11 B-K3 | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

13 R-B3
With the intention of continuing straightforwardly $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ and then 15 Q-R5. This little demonstration on the $K$ side is intended to force the Black Queen to occupy the not very favourable position at K1.

13 ... Q-K1
To reply to $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ with $14 \ldots$. $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$, preventing $15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$.
14 R-Q1
R-Q1
$15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$
P-KB4

Position after Black's 15 th move


The weakness of the KP is not important, and now White's attack on the K side is no longer possible. $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

Avoiding simplifying exchanges. Now both sides manœuvre, to get the most advantageous position for their men.

| 16 | $\ldots$ | B-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | Q-B2 |
| 18 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | KR-K1 |
| 19 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 3)-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ |
| 20 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | Q-B2 |
| 21 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |  |

Premature! Correct here is 21 P-Kt3.
21 ...
$\mathbf{K t}(\mathbf{K t} 3)-\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{2}$

22 Q-Q2
B-K2
$23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
White avoids the exchange, as it would give Black a little freedom. Nor is the time ripe for a breakthrough in the centre: $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P} ; 25 \mathrm{~B}-$ Kt3, B-B4 ch; $26 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; or $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.
23
24 Q-B1
It is necessary to forestall a possible $24 \ldots$, B-Kt5 followed by $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$.
$24 \ldots \quad$ Kt-K5
More exact, even so, is $24 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, to which White's best reply is $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt}$.
$25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times$ B

Black's second Knight should try to get to his K5, so it would have been more to the point to exchange at White's B3. Now White can defend his K4 satisfactorily.

| $26 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $28 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |

Threatening $29 \ldots$, B-Kt5

| 29 | P-QR4 | R-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | P-Kt3 | Q-Q1 |
| 31 | K-Kt2 | B-Kt4 |
| 32 | Q-B3 | Q-K2 |

32 Q-B3
Q-K2
$33 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$
As the result of these prolonged manœuvres White has increased his, positional superiority. While Black is condemned to passive defence, White can establish a Knight on Q6 or by advancing the QKtP can create real threats on the Q side. With his next move Black prevents the pawn advance, but he is impotent against the Knight transfer.
33 ..
$34 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1 \quad$ Q-B1
P-QR4

| $35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| 36 Kt 4 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $37 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t} 1$ |  |
| White could have sacr |  |
| piece for three pawns: 38 K |  |
| $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 39 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K}$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, and White's passe |  |
| should ensure his win. |  |
| $38 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $41 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| $42 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 3)-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| $43 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |

Stronger than $43 \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$; $44 \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$; as Black's Queen would get some freedom.

| 43 | $\ldots$ | Q-R1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | R-K3 | K-B2 |
| 45 | Q-B4 |  |

Inexact! The King should first have been withdrawn from the KR1QR8 diagonal, and then White could start decisive operations. Black exploits White's negligence, and finds an interesting tactical stroke.
$45 \ldots$
46 Q-B2
P-QKt4!
It was fortunate for White that there was a move retaining his superiority. Of course not $46 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ (e.p.), P-B4 dis. ch., nor $46 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ dis. ch.
46 ...
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$

Black's combination proves unsound, and he quickly loses. However, also after $46 \ldots$, R-R2; 47 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R}-\mathrm{R} 7$; $48 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ dis. ch; $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ White's two passed pawns guarantee his win. $46 \ldots$... $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ provided a more stubborn defence.

| 47 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 48 | $\mathbf{K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| 49 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{B} 4$ dis. ch |
| Q-B7 ch | K-Kt1 |

$50 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$
R-KB1
51 Q-Q6

Position after Black's 46th move


There is a second road to the win in the continuation: $51 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$; 52 Q-Q6, with the irrefutable threat of $53 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$.

| $51 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $52 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

As hopeless for Black is $53 \ldots$, Q-R8; $54 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, or $53 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $54 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $55 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$; 56 P-Q8(Q), Q-R4 ch; $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$.

White now cannot play $54 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 55 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7} ; 56 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, P-Kt8(Q); 57 P-Q8(Q), Q-B8 ch; with mate in two moves, but there is a possibility of forcing an easily won Rook endgame.
$54 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$55 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$
$56 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$
R-Q1
57 P-Kt6
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$

Here the game was adjourned, but Black resigned without further play. There could follow: $57 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; 58 K-Kt2, K-Kt3; $59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 60 R-Kt5, K-K3; $61 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $62 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $63 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ (the pawn endgame is hopeless for Black); $64 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $65 \mathrm{R}-$ B5 ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $66 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, and wins.

No. 50. Sicilian Defence
I. Kann
(White)
M. Botvinnik
(Black)

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |  |

An idea deserving serious attention. White has in mind an immediate pawn attack on the $K$ side, while Black has no better continuation than $8 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ and $9 \ldots$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, as otherwise White will Castle short, and then a well known variation unfavourable to Black will result.

| 8 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 P-B4 | B-K3 |
| 10 | P-Kt4 |
|  | Kt-QR4 |

In reply to White's flank attack Black should have undertaken an active counter-attack in the centre, by $10 \ldots$, P-Q4! (see Game No. 53, Alekhine-Botvinnik). Now White's attack grows dangerous.

## $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ <br> Kt-K1

This is unquestionably better than $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, as afterwards the Knight can occupy Kt2, where it is useful for defence.

## 12 Q-Q2

White determines the Queen's position prematurely. The correct move is $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ at once, as Voltliss played against Eliskases (tournament at Podebrad, 1936).
$12 \ldots$ R-B1
Sacrificing the QRP. White refuses the sacrifice, for after $13 \ldots$, B-B5 it would lose several important tempi and relinquish the initiative to Black.

13 B-Q4 Kt-B5
Stronger is $13 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 5$; e.g. $14 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}(14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; and not $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ because of $15 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{Q} 4) ; 16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 17$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ ) is followed by $14 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{K} 2) ; 15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ (or $15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}(\mathrm{Q} 2)$ ), $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$; and the Knight's strong position gives Black opportunities of counter-attack.

| $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

After this passive move the initiative passes to White. Black should have continued 16 ..., P-Kt4 with an approximately equal game.

## 17 P-KR4 B-Kt5

Black must prevent the opening of the KR file.

## 18 R-Q2

Retreat to K1 would be more exact. The Rook's position on the same diagonal as the King provides Black with combinative possibilities.
18 ...
P-Kt3
$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$

If $19 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$, then $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}$; $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, B-K3; $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and Black has fully equal play.

## 19 ... <br> P-K4

With passive play Black would be slowly asphyxiated after P-KB5.

## 20 B-B3

Apparently $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ is also without danger to Black because of $20 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}(\mathrm{bad}$ is $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $21 \mathrm{R}-$ Kt1, B-R4; 22 B-K3, and Black has nothing he can move); 21 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch (22 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KR} 3 ; 23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $24 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is hardly any stronger), $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, Q-K3; 24 R-B2, K-R1.
20 ...
P-B4

Position after Black's 20th move


An extremely sharp and complex position has arisen. To $21 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ Black can reply simply 21 $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}(22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is not dangerous to him). Possibly strongest of all now for White is $21 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$, and White preserves his Knight at Q5.

The continuation White chooses gives the advantage to Black.
$21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ e.p.
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$
$22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
23 Q-Q5 ch

Nothing in $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 ; 24$ Q-Q5 ch, B-K3; $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 6$ ! and White does not get adequate compensation for the exchange.
23 ...
R-B2

The move that decides the game! If now $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$, then $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; or $24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, and White is in a bad way. Now White makes a pawn sacrifice which gives him nothing and only speeds up the loss.

| 24 | P-KR5 | $\mathbf{P} \times R \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | R-Kt1 |  |

In sacrificing the pawn White evidently overlooked that after 25 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 26 \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q} ;$ $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $29 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ch he is a Rook down.
25 ...
Q-B3
$26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
The strong passed Rook-pawn secures Black the win. So there is no sense in complicating the game by winning the exchange at the price of laying bare his King's position.

| 27 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}(3)-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |

The continuation $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ leads to loss of material because of $29 \ldots$, R-B8 ch; $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$.

| $29 \ldots$ | B-R3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | R-B7 |
| $31 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |

$31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$ does not save the game, because of $31 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7$ (to defend the R4 pawn), followed by $32 \ldots$ R(B2)-B7.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 2)-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 34 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |  |

White's game is lost, but even so he should have chosen $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$; although here also the advance of the KRP is decisive.

| $34 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ |
| $36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 7)-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| $37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $38 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 7$ |
| $41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| $42 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | B-Kt2 |
| $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
| $44 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QRP}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7$ |
| $45 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| $46 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
| 47 Kt 3 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $48 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
|  | Resigns |
|  |  |

## NOTTINGHAM INTERNATIONAL TOURNAMENT

 August| No. 51. Queen's Indian Defence | $11 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bogoljubov | Botvinnik | 12 Q-K2 |


| Bogoljubov | Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |

$\begin{array}{lll}1 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3 \\ 2 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3\end{array}$
3 P-K3
Here $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ is admitted to be the strongest continuation. With the system White has chosen Black can easily equalize.

| 3 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

To the immediate $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ Black would reply with advantage: 5 ..., P-QKt4; $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, P-Kt5; $7 \mathrm{Kt}-$ K2, P-K3. Now White has prepared P-Q5, which forces Black to exchange in the centre. After the exchange the advance of White's QP will not have its previous force.

| 5 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 8 | O-O | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |  |

Black threatened $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ and $\mathrm{P} \times$ BP , thus isolating the Q 4 pawn; but if $9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, White would have some compensation in the better disposition of his pieces.

Even so White vainly rejects $9 \mathrm{P}-$ Q5!, while Black still has to overcome certain difficulties (e.g. not $9 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP} \mathrm{ch})$.

$$
9 \ldots
$$

10 B-K3
Here apparently 10 Q-K2, Kt-B3; $11 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q1}$ is better, so preventing Kt-K5. Now Black seizes the initiative.
10 ...
Kt-K5

12 Q-K2
White continues his development, but in two or three moves it will be clear that his game has reached a dead end. Very much to the point is the circumstance that $12 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ is met by $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! ; $13 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $B \times P$, isolating the $Q P$.
12.
R-B1
13 KR-Q1

After $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$; 14 Kt-R7, R-B2; 15 B-B4, Kt-Q3; the position of the Knight at R7 is by no means enviable.
13 ...
P-B4
14 B-B4

A decisive mistake! Bad too is $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt} 5$ (with the fundamental threat of $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P})$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-$ R7, R-R1; $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 17$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathbf{Q})-\mathrm{KB} 3$ and Black gets superiority in material; but with the modest $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktl}$ followed by $P \times P$ and exchanges on the QB file White could relieve the tension a little.
14 ...
P-KKt4!
Position after Black's 14th move


15 B-K5
Or: (1) $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ ! (bad is
$15 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; 16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, with more than adequate compensation for the piece); $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$; (2) $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}!; 17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 18 $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ and White gets too little for the loss of the exchange.

| $15 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |

$17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2!$; $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is only an interchange of moves.

| $17 \ldots$ | QP $\times$ B |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}}{ }$ | Q-B2 |

The only move! If White succeeds in establishing his Knight at Q6 he will have the better position. However, with the capture of the pawn at K5, White is deprived of strong points in the centre.
$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$
20 R-Q7
B-Kt4
$21 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{B} 1)-\mathrm{Q} 1$

Equivalent to surrender, but there

## No. 52. King's Indian Defence

| $\quad$$M$. Botvinnik <br> (White)  | S. Tartakower <br> (Black) |
| ---: | :--- |
| $1 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ Kt-KB3 <br> 2 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | P-Q3 |
| 3 P-Q4 |  |

Tartakower was fond of playing Philidor's Defence (especially against weak opponents). As the game proceeds we get fundamentally this defence, only White has made the unusual move $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$. But in this game his calculation proves unsound.
$\qquad$ QKt-Q2
Black sets up a strong point in the centre-at K4.

## 4 P-KKt3

This system is undoubtedly the best, as the fianchettoed Bishop at
is nothing better. $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$;
$22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8$ ! and $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; and, finally, $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 22 Q-Q1, B-R3; 23 Q-Q7, B-Kt2 all lose.
21 ...
B-QB3
$22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QRP}$
Otherwise Black would keep the pawn, and White would be condemned to slow destruction; the continuation White chooses loses at once, as Black captures the Q file.
$22 \ldots$

QR-Q1
23 P-KR4
There is no defence.

| $23 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

Or 25 Q-K2, R-Q7; 26 Q-B1, P-K6.
$25 \ldots$
B-Q7
White resigns, as he cannot simultaneously defend himself against $26 \ldots$, P-K6 and $26 \ldots$, Q-R8.

Kt2 will be a reliable defence for the King.

| $4 \ldots$ | P-K4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

The popular modern continuation, $5 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ is stronger.

| $6 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

The only way of developing the Queen's Bishop. After the Queen's transfer to B2 the Knight at Q2 will no longer be necessary for the defence of the KP, and can be moved to release Queen's Bishop.
No relief comes from $7 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt3} ; 9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt} ; 12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; or simply $8 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, and White commands much more space.

| 8 | P-K4 | Q-B2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | P-KR3 | R-K1 |
| 10 | B-K3 | Kt-B1 |
| 11 | R-B1 | P-KR3 |

An unsound plan. Normally in Philidor's Defence Black can attempt a K-side attack with pawns; but here this is out of place, as the Bishop at Kt 2 defends the King excellently. Moreover, as the King is covered by this Bishop White can himself go over io the counter-attack, even at the cost of destroying the pawn screen of the Castled position.

$$
12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2
$$

If at once $12 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$, then 13 P-KR4, Kt-Kt5; $14 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-$ R2, Kt-Kt3; 17 Q-R5, and Black's K side is hopelessly weak.

## $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ <br> P-KKt4

Black needs to make only one move-Kt-Kt3, and his position will be excellent, as White cannot then play P-B4. But at this very moment White plays P-B4 and breaks through Black's K side, where it is very difficult for Black to organize defence.

The sound tactic is the waiting move $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; but in that case White plays $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$ and begins an attack on the Q side.
14 P-B4
$\mathrm{KtP} \times \mathbf{P}$
$15 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$

If $15 \ldots, K \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$. Black is threatened with $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, which would lead to the loss of his R3 pawn. Even so this would be a better way out of the present situation, as now Black saves the pawn, but loses the game.

| $16 \underset{\mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B} 5}$ | $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |

With the serious threat of P-Q6. Black cannot allow the passed QP,
so he is forced to allow a White Knight on the central Q5.
$17 \ldots \quad \mathbf{P} \times P$
$18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
Of course, not $18 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$.

| $18 \ldots$ | Q-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

The Knight at Q6 is invulnerable. If $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, then $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

Black defends his KB2, because of a possible $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 22 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R} ; 23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 \mathrm{ch}$.

To $20 \ldots$, R-B1 White intended to continue as in the game. Here it was also possible to win the exchange, but it was still simpler to decide the game by a direct attack on the Black King.
$21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
If $21 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, and White wins the Knight.
$22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
An obvious sacrifice.
$22 \ldots$
$\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$
23 Q-R5 Kt-Kt3

Position after Black's 23rd move


The only way of freeing the King's road of retreat to the Q side, without giving up defence of the KBP. If the King succeeds in slipping away (e.g. after $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ !) Black
will have chances of salvation. But how can White prevent the Black King from fleeing?

## 24 Kt-B5!!

This quiet move, which it was not easy to foresee, ends the struggle. The Knight at B5 is invulnerable; to $24 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ White replies 25 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, and Black loses his Knight. To $24 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ White replies 25 P-KR4, $\quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RP} ; 26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, QR-Q1; $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 28$

## No. 53. Sicilian Defence

| $\quad$Alekhine <br> (White) | Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| ---: | :--- |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

If Black intends to play the "dragon" variation, this is the order of moves he must choose. If $2 \ldots$. $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3 ; 3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ White prevents $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$, as Rauzer pointed out.

| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |  |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} 3$ |  |
| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |  |

A little later Rauzer introduced the strong $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ into tournament practice. At the time of the Notting. ham tournament this move was not yet known.

At this point I had a feeling that Alekhine had prepared some novelty in the vigorous variation which Kann had applied against me in Moscow (Game No. 50).

| 6 | $\ldots$ | B-KKt2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | B-K3 | Kt-B3 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | B-K3 |
| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | O-O |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

This counter-stroke in the centre (stronger than $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, as in
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ mate. What follows now is obvious.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt1}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| $30 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ | Resigns |

This game was awarded the brilliancy prize in the Nottingham tournament.
the Botvinnik-Kann game) is absolutely correct from both the combinative and the positional aspect.

## $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$

If $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}(12$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ), $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, White achieves nothing. (Levenfish-Botvinnik, Moscow, 1936.)
11 ...
B-B1
$12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
13 P-Q6

This was Alekhine's novelty! If $13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, then $14 \ldots, B \times P ; 15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP} \quad \mathrm{ch} ; 18 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; $20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ and Black's position is rather the better.

Here Keres advised playing 13 B-B3, but it must be assumed that in this case Black has an adequate game in prospect (see, e.g. the Bondarevsky-Alatortsev game, Tbilisi, 1937).
13 ...
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$

The only move. If $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$; then $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, and $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$.
Now White achieves nothing after $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; but he finds a very strong move.
14 B-B5

Position after White's 14th move


How should Black play now? If $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ( $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ); 16 P-Kt5, Kt-Q2; 17 P-B6, B-R1;

No. 54. Queen's Gambit Declined

| Botvinnik | Vidmar |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

Over the usual 7 R-QB1 this move had only the advantage that it had been less studied. With his following manœuvre Black isolates the central White QP.

| 7 OMO | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 O |  |

White is forced to accept the isolation of the QP , as if $8 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $K t \times P$, exchanges easing Black's defence are inevitable.

```
8 ...
P}\times\mathbf{QP
9 KP}\times
```

Of course, not $9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$; followed by $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$. Now White has the isolated QP. But in
$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ his situation is not enviable. However, with a two-piece sacrifice Black gets perpetual check.

| $14 \ldots$ | Q-B5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ |
| $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Only thus! If $16 \ldots$, Q-Kt6 ch; $17 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! White has gained the tempo necessary to his defence. Also inadequate is $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$; $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.
$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Q-Kt6 ch
18 R-B2
Q-Kt8 ch

19 R-B1
Drawn, as White cannot decline the perpetual check.
the middle-game it greatly cramps Black; Black can best exploit its weakness in the endgame, but as it happens, the game doesn't get so far.

| $9 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| $10 \underset{\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}}{ }$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

This manœuvre is not entirely sound. Better is $10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ ! and if $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$, then $11 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; then White's Q side would be weakened.
11 B-Kt3
B-Q2
Q-Q3 $\quad \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Q} 4$

Black is afraid of phantoms. He feared that $12 \ldots, \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ would be followed by $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$. But then Black could play $13 \ldots$, P-KKt3 and because of the double threat $14 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ and $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ White achieves nothing. But if 12 ..., KKt-Q4; $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{QR} 5$, or $12 \ldots$, $\mathrm{KKt}-$ Q4; $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 5$, simplifications favourable to Black would be forced.
$13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$
B-B3
14 QR-Q1

Black's situation is now not easy. $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ is followed by 15 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ with an excellent game. Probably the best of all is $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$; and if possible $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 5$. True, after $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; 15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 17$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ also White's game is to be preferred.

Black's next move loses time, and White strengthens his position still more.

| 14 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QKt5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| $16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt} 5) \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |

Necessary is $16 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3) \times$ Kt ; e.g. $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B}) \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 17 $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ !; and White's attack is repulsed, or $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 17 B-B1, R-B1 and still Black can breathe more easily. Evidently he had no suspicion how dangerous was his situation.

## 17 P-KB4

With the iriesistible threat of $\mathrm{P}_{-}$ B5. $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ is followed simply by 18 B-R6, R-K1; 19 BR4, winning the exchange. The idea of White's manœuvre is that the natural move $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ (with the intention of $18 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ or $18 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ) is followed by the sparkling $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}!$ !, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 19$ $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$, or $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B P}, \quad \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 19 QR-K1!! and in either case White wins back the piece, while retaining his crushing positional superiority.

| 17 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

Not much better is $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $19 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad(19 \ldots, \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; 20 Q-KB3); $20 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, and Black has difficulty in defending the K3 pawn.
$19 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$
Q-Q3

This loses out of hand. But even with the better $19 \ldots$, R-B2; 20 QR-KB1 White's preponderance is obvious. Two fine variations were found by the master V. Panov.

## Position after Black's 19th move


(1) $19 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $20 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{KB} 1$, P-QR3; $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 22 $B(K t 3) \times K t, \quad Q K t \times B ; \quad 23 R \times R$, B $\times$ B; 24 Q-K6!
(2) $19 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 20 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{KB} 1$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ (threatening to sacrifice both Rooks at KB6), $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $23 \mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{Kt} 3) \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}!!$

In these variations also the Knight sacrifice plays the decisive role.
$20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
If $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, then $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch.
$21 \mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{Kt} 5) \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$
Or $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} ; 23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch.
$22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$
The last little trap: 23 R-B5 is met by $23 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch.

| 23 R-Q6 | Q-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 R-Q7 | Resigns |

This game was awarded a prize for the best game of the round.

## NINETEEN THIRTY-EIGHT

Afrer the Nottingham tournament I had a serious piece of work before me: the completion of my post-Graduate course at the Polytechnic Institute. Under Professor A. Goriev, I worked on my thesis for seven months; in June, 1937, I presented it to the Council of the Faculty of Electro-mechanics and was awarded my B.Sc.(tech.).

Of course my work on the thesis made it impossible for me to take part in the U.S.S.R. Tenth Championship, held at Tbilisi in 1937. In the autumn I played off a match with Levenfish, who had won the championship. I was in poor form, and some of the games were ruined by obvious blunders. The result was a draw, and Levenfish retained the title of Soviet Champion.

In the spring of 1938 I took part in the semi-finals of the U.S.S.R. Eleventh Championship, held in Leningrad. I played for the sake of training, and was not entirely unsuccessful.

In the autumn of 1938 I played in one of the most difficult tournaments I have ever known: the "Avro" International Tournament held at Amsterdam. The organizers were the Avro Wireless Company, and the eight finest players of the world came together as opponents. The tournament was organized on a strictly "business" basis. Before it began every competitor had to sign a document declaring that he had full confidence in the Organizing Committee on all questions relating to the manner in which the tournament was conducted.

The Organizing Committee did not justify so much confidence. We players were compelled to "travel round" all Holland, for the tournament was played off in ten towns. On days of play the competitors went without dinner. In such circumstances it is hardly surprising that the "old guard," Capablanca and Alekhine, were among the failures.

In the first round I was beaten by Reuben Fine, but then I took myself in hand, and in the course of ten rounds played three good games, against Reshevsky, Alekhine, and Capablanca, drawing right up to the leaders, Fine and Keres. However, I lost to Euwe (an inexcusable blunder in exchange); and a weak finish resulted in my taking third place.

Though in terms of formal success I did not do too well in this contest, it played a big part in giving me confidence in my own powers-never before had I succeeded in winning from both Alekhine and Capablanca!

## U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP SEMI-FINALS, LENINGRAD

 MayNo. 55. Grünfeld Defence

| A. Sokolsky <br> (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 P-QB4 | Kt-KB3 |
| 2 Kt-QB3 | P-Q4 |

If Black wishes to turn the "English Opening" into the "Grün-
feld Defence" this is most simply achieved by $2 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |  |

A quiet and reliable continuation; however, $5 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ is more energetic.

## 6 B-K2 <br> P-K3

This move (replying to 6 Q-Kt3) followed by the Knight manœuvre QKt-B3-K2 was introduced into tournament play by Alatortsey (Levenfish-Alatortsev, Leningrad, 1929). In the present game Black associates the move with the fianchetto of the Queen's-Bishop.

## 7 O-O

P-Kt3
$8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Probably premature; it gives Black a half-open K file with a strong point at K5, while White has no good squares for his pieces on the half-open B file.
Here it is sound to continue 8 Q-Kt3 (Flohr-Botvinnik, Leningrad, 1933, and Bronstein-Santasierre, Moscow-New York Match, 1945) with an approximately equal game.
8 ...
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
9 P-QKt3

A blunder, after which Black's position on the $Q$ side becomes invulnerable. Now the White Queen is unable to occupy the squares on which she would be posted actively.

White should have played 9 QKt3 followed by $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$.

| 9 | $\ldots$ | B-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | B-Kt2 | QKt-Q2 |
| 11 | Q-B2 |  |

Position after White's 11th move


It is gradually becoming apparent that White has no plan of play whatever, and is occupied only with the "development" of his pieces. Perhaps this was sufficient fifty years ago, but in our day, when at the sixth to eighth move every master formulates his plan for the middlegame, there is no "better" way of getting a cramped and passive position than by aiming only at development.

Even now White could still occupy the central K5 with his Knight, which would lead to a struggle with double-edged possibilities. In a move or two this will prove impossible, and the control of the central squares will pass to Black.

| $11 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 QR-B1 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| $13 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

It is not without interest to note that none of White's pieces can pass beyond the fourth rank.

| $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | KR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

Another positional blunder. The weakness of the Black QB and Q pawns cannot be exploited merely by attacking them from the back rank when both sides still have the minor pieces on the board. Meanwhile White parts with his last stronghold in the centre, his Queen's pawn, which leads to livelier activity from the Black Bishop at QKt2, and the tempo of the "struggle" accelerates.
16 ...
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

White rightly decides that Black's main blow will be aimed against his K side, and brings up the Knight to defend his King; so $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R4}$ would be worse.

$$
17 \ldots \quad \text { B-R3! }
$$

Position after White's 17th move


The beginning of an attack which rapidly develops into all-out assault and leads to a won position for Black. The first blow is aimed against the badly defended KB2 square. En route Black avoids an exchange of the black-square Bishops which would ease White's situation somewhat. With his next move White averts Black's threat of $18 \ldots$, P-Q5 but in doing so his Bis'? retires from the QR1-KR8 diagoial, which quickly has its effect.

## 18 B-R3 <br> Kt-Kt5

$18 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ would of course be met by $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$.
A new danger now threatens White, namely: $19 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 20$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $21 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$; $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt}$, Kt-R6 dis. ch with a smothered mate, and there may also be a possibility of $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$. In defending the KP with his Queen White gives Black yet another tempo for attack.
19 Q-Q3
$\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 2)-\mathrm{K} 4$
$20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Now the White Knight will defend his King, but in order to do so he must occupy a not very convenient position ..., at R1! Black exploits the lack of a Knight in the centre and advances the QP.
$21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
Q-B3!
$22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 1$
White has no choice, for $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is followed by $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $23 \mathrm{P}-$ R3, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$.

| $22 \ldots$ | P-Q5! |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 | Q-K2 |

All Black's pieces are acting in harmony, and the menacing Bishops are especially good. How can White defend himself? $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is followed by $24 \ldots$, Kt-Q2; $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (otherwise $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ ), $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP}$; 26 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$; bad also is $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch} ; 26$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 27 \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch}$; and White has lost the exchange. Perhaps the best resistance follows $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 6$; $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}(25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6!; 26$ $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ ), $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R} ; 27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, though in this variation too, Black's extra piece assures him the win.
$24 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

Given the energetic support of all Black's pieces the passed Q pawn is quickly queened! Not $24 \ldots, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ because of $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.
$25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$ !
Position after Black's 25th move


The last difficult move of the game. After $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$,

White could still hold out. Unquestionably the Black Rook must be left at Q 1 , where it supports the passed QP; in addition Black wins an essential tempo, inasmuch as there is a threat of $26 \ldots$, B-Kt5. White could resist rather longer if he now played 26 P-R3, P-Q6; 27 Q-K4, P-Q7; the text move hastens the denouement.
26 R-K1 P-Q6
Now all is clear, for a loss follows
$27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$; $29 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch} ; 30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \mathrm{ch}$.

27 Q-Q1
B-Kt5
28 Q-R1

## No. 56. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik (White) | V. Chekhover (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt5 |
| 4 Kt -B3 |  |

A continuation which has no serious difficulties for Black in the opening; but the opening is usually followed by the middle-game.
4 ... O-O
Here Lisitsin and Keres prefer $4 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$.

| 5 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

In this variation it is not so easy for Black to release himself from the pin at KB3 (see Game No. 48). As he proceeds Chekhover improves Black's game somewhat, playing P-QB4, which increases the pressure on White's centre but simultaneously weakens the central Q4.

| $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |
| 8 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ could be followed by $8 \ldots$, |

Hopeless, too, is $28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, because of the obvious sacrifice $28 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 30$ Q-Kt1, P-Q7; $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$.

| 28 | P-Q7 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | P-Q8(Q) |
| $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ (B3) | B-K7 |
| $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | B-Kt2 |
| 33 Q-B6 | B-Kt4 |
| 34 Q-B1 | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $35 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | R-K8 |
| $36 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | R-R8 |
| $37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | B-Q6 |
| $38 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | R-Kt8 |
| $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathbf{B} \times$ B |
| $40 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ B | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| Resigns |  |

$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$; $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$, P-KKt4; 11 B-Kt3, Kt-K5 and Black is completely free.

| 8 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 12 | QR-K1 |  |

It is necessary to defend the Bishop before carrying out $\mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ followed by P-B4. By the way, by mistake this game was originally published with the move $12 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, which is without sense, for White must aim at opening the KB file. It is interesting to note that not one commentator (and there were quite a few commentators on this game) drew attention to White's obvious "blunder" of $12 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, which was, fortunately, a blunder on the part of the reporter who transcribed the game.
$12 \ldots$
B-Kt5
In the given situation this is playable, as White lacks the move 13 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$ (see Game No. 48). Now the manœuvre $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is also
impossible because of $13 \ldots, B \times B$; $14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; and so new ways have to be sought. It is quite natural that White should decide to centre play round the weak Q5 square, to do which he must exchange off the Black Knight at KB3.
Position after Black's 12th move

$13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$
14 Q-K4
$B \times K t$

Black is taking the line of least resistance. During the game I was afraid of the continuation: $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; and White's pieces lose their cohesion.

But if $14 \ldots$, B-B1; $15 \mathrm{Kt-Q} 2$, Q-Q1 (15 ..., Kt-B3; 16 P-B4, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 17 \mathrm{KBP} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! This is where the Rook posted at KB1 comes in useful); $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}$; $17 \mathrm{R}-$ Q1, White retains a slight advantage.

Now White has easy play and a clear plan, for by the Bishop exchange Black has weakened his central white squares.

| $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}!$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 17 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 18 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |

Black's situation is difficult. Not, for instance, $18 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 19$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, Kt-K2 (19 ..., Kt-Q1; 20 Q-QR4); $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; 21 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, and his pawn chain on the Q side is shattered.

The continuation $18 \ldots$, Q-K2; 19 KR-Q1, P-Kt3; is rather better than the text move. In this case White would retain his centralized Queen with $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$.
Chekhover's design was wily: he was aiming at a Rook exchange at Q4 and wanted to provoke White into obtaining a passed QP , which it would be possible to block.

Position after Black's 18th move

$19 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$
Kt-R4
$20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$
$21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$

The exchanging off of one pair of Rooks does not improve Black's situation. Naturally, after $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, Q-Q3! (only not $21 \ldots$, Kt-Kt2; 22 Q-R4!) Black's position would certainly be no worse.
$21 \ldots \quad$ Q-K2
No use $21 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$, and if $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; then $23 \mathrm{R}-$ $\mathbf{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$; 25 Q-K4 ch, winning a piece.

At the moment it may seem that Black has succeeded in putting up a satisfactory defence, but the following shrewd manœuvre with the Bishop dispels all illusions.

## $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ !

Threatening $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.


B-B5!!


Essentially the decisive move. The White Queen is defended, and Black is unable to resist the Rook irruption into the seventh rank. Then Black will be forced into the Queen exchange (otherwise he risks being mated) and White has only to transfer the Bishop to Q5 to deprive Black's pieces finally of mobility.

If $23 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, White could continue either $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, or the more energetic $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; 25 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ !

| $23 \ldots$ | Q-Kt1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | R-Q7 | R-Q1 |

Forced; otherwise $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, K-B1; 26 Q-Q5. Now the game is transposed to an endgame difficult for Black.

| $25 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{K P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4!$ |  |

Of course White should not be turned aside from his plan just for the sake of taking the QRP, especially as the variation $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; 28 B-Q3, P-B5; 29 B-B1, Kt-Kt4; 30 R-R6, R-QB1 would suit Black perfectly.

## 27 ... <br> Kt-R6

Black cannot hinder the KP's advance, and so he resorts to various tactical devices to maintain the balance in material somehow or other.
28 B-Q5 R-KB1
29 P-K4 P-QR4

Or $29 \ldots$, P-B5; $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$; 32 $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{KP}$; $33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$, and Black is a pawn down.

| 30 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 32 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K} 5$ |
| 33 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4!$ |

Position after White's 33rd move


When the game was finished Chekhover remarked that down to this point he still felt confident of a draw, but now he realized that his position was hopeless. If Black prevents the formation of a passed KP he loses the pawns on the Q side. In any case White can transfer the King to the centre.

| 33 | Kt-Q5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 34 K-B2 | P-Kt4 |
| $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $36 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-K3 |
| 37 K-K3 | P-B5 |
| Desperation! |  |
| 38 P-B5 | Kt-B4 |
| 39 R-B7 | Kt-Q6 |
| 40 P-K6 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

Here the game was adjourned. Black did not trouble to renew it when he learned that White had sealed the move $41 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}(41 \ldots$, R-K1; 42 P-K7 dis. ch, K-Kt2; 43 B-B6).

## AVRO INTERNATIONAL TOURNAMENT, AMSTERDAM

 NovemberNo. 57. English Opening

| M. Botvinnik (White) | S. Reshevsky (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K4 |
| 2 Kt -QB3 | Kt-QB3 |

The result is the close Variation of the Sicilian Defence with colours reversed. In the Sicilian Defence this variation leads to complicated play; here his possession of an extra tempo should lead to a definite advantage for White.

| 3 | P-KKt3 | P-KKt3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | B-Kt2 | B-Kt2 |
| 5 | P-K3 |  |

Of course it is more convenient to develop the KKt to K 2 ; in view of the possible Black P-KB4 the Knight would be badly placed at KB3.

| 5 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6 \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
| 7 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Not a bad plan. Although Black relinquishes his pawn centre he plans to get compensation by exerting pressure with his pieces.
$8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
Kt -B4

The dogmatic rule that a Bishop is superior to a Knight is so widespread that Reshevsky would not play the variation $9 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, Kt-B4; 12 P-Q5, Kt-K4; 13 Q-B2, R-K1; in which Black's task of equalizing would be simplified. Even so, in this game Black failed to selve the problem of developing his Queen's Bishop.
$10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
Kt-K4
11 P-Kt3 P-QR4

A stereotyped plan. Black aims to secure QB4 for his Knight, but that
proves impracticable, as White will plav $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$.

There was more initiative in 11 , P-QR3; 12 B-Kt2, P-QKt4; $13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, with counterplay. But of course it is easier to find this plan in home analysis, after the game is finished, than at the board.
12 B-Kt2
Kt-Q2
13 P-QR3
Kt-B4

All this takes time, and so Black cannot exploit the weakening of White's pawns on the Q side.
14 P-QKt4
Kt-Q2
Position after Black's 14th move


It was attractive to try $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$, Kt-QR3; attacking the QKtP. But the withdrawal of the Knight from defence of KB3 leads to 17 Kt-K4!, Kt $\times$ QKtP; 18 P-Kt4!, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$ (or $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$; $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$; 20 Q-R1 ch, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 21 $\mathrm{K} t \times \mathrm{P}) ; \quad 19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}(19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, Kt-Kt5; $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{KB} 4), \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, Kt-Kt1; $22 \mathrm{Kt}(2)-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ and White has a dangerous initiative. 15 Q-Kt3 Kt-Q5
A serious blunder on Black's part,
after which White's superiority is apparent. Of course, the better continuation is $15 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, achieving simplification, though, truly, at the cost of loss of the QR file.
$16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$B \times K t$
17 QR-Q1

A quite timely avoidance of the Rook exchange on the QR file, for Black's Rooks will be separated for some time by the awkward position of his Queen's Bishop. White is guaranteed possession of the $K$ file; and the Rook at Q1 will prove very useful.

| $17 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

With one move depriving the Black Queen's Bishop of two squares for its development: $20 \ldots, B-B 4$ can be met by $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$. With his next move Black temporarily secures B4 for the Bishop, but the manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5-Q4}$ leads to its retreat, and Q7 will be under fire after P-QB5-B6. It is not surprising that in the end the Bishop will be forced to return to B1!

| $20 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |
| 22 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Position after Black's 22nd move


The Bishop tosses about the board in search of a haven. Yet perhaps it was not too late to play $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, securing the KR2-Kt8 diagonal for it. Evidently Reshevsky could not bring himself to make such a "desperate" move.

## 23 P-B6

$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
After this White's win is only a question of time. After the exchange of his QP for Black's KtP both White's King's Bishop and his Rook at Q1 will become active, which is of decisive importance. $23 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is more logical.
$24 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
B-B1

If $24 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 ; 25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 27 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$, Q-B2; $28 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}(28 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 29 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ dis. ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 30 R-Q3); $29 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 30 Kt-B4, Q-Kt2; 31 Q-Q3 and White wins.
$25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$
The natural consequence of Black's mistake at the 23 rd move. White has a won position, of course, but I decided on this move only after much vacillation, as the variation: $25 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; gives Black some counter-chances. However, after 28 B-R1, the passed QKtP should decide the outcome.
$25 \ldots$
B-K3
Reshevsky is in great time-trouble, and he makes a useless move, as White could reply simply: 26 Kt -B4. Taking his opponent's time difficulty into account, White prefers to go in for complications.

```
\(26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}\)
\(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}\)
\(27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5\)
```

Of course $27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch would be a mistake. K-R2, and the Knight at Q6 is lost.

NINETEEN THIRTY-EIGHT
27 ...
Q-K1

Even so, rather better is $27 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, which, however, only drags out the struggle. $28 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$

$$
\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K t}
$$

Position after Black's 28th move


Now White has only to capture the QBP in order to liquidate the last

No. 58. Queen's Gambit Accepted (by transposition)

| M. Botvinnik | A. Alekhine |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

This variation arose three times in the Alekhine-Euwe Return Match. Black aims at simplification, in order to facilitate his defence. The main variation $5 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 7 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $10 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, has no dangers for Black. Alekhine was well acquainted with Euwe's continuation: 5 B-Kt5, $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 6 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! so I chose another road, more modest, and often followed by Soviet masters.
$5 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
opposition. The finish shows what menacing force the Bishops acquire in open positions.
29 R-Q7 ch
R-B2
30 B-K5!

With a double attack, on the pawn and on the Knight at KB3, in conjunction with $31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 3$. Of course $30 \ldots, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ is not possible because of $31 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$, winning the Rook.

$$
30 \ldots \quad \text { K-Kt1 }
$$

Further "resistance" is useless.

| $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $32 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $34 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$ |
| $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $36 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2!$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8(\mathrm{Q})$ |

A triumph for two Bishops!

This is a very reliable continuation, but it appears to lead to equality. In one game of his return match with Euwe, Alekhine played $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$, but that also should lead to an equal game.

$$
6 \ldots \quad \text { Kt-QB3 }
$$

7 B-B4
I thought of this move at the board, after I was convinced that the variation $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$; $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} ; \quad 9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, P-K4, formerly met with, brings White no gain.

Black can most easily defend himself from the threat of $8 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; \quad 9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ by playing $7 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$. It is easy to see that this move leads to a well-known position in the Queen's Gambit Accepted, rightly regarded as leaving an equal game.
Alekhine let slip this possibility, and after his next move he got into a difficuit situation.

| $7 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

10 R-K1
White's position is superior. Though the QP is isolated, it cramps Black considerably. But above all White has a wealth of possibilities with his pieces, the direct result of $7 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, whereas Black still has to solve the problem of developing his Queen's Bishop.

## 10 ...

P-QKt3
Probably this is a decisive mistake. Black should first play $10 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ (securing the long diagonal for his Queen's Bishop); $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and then $11 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK}$ 3. True, even so the White QP is strengthened and White has obtained fair chances on the K side, but Black should have played thus. This, by the way, was how the Botvinnik-Szabo game went (Groningen, 1946).

Now White reduces the game to prosaic pressure on Black's Q side, weakened by his tenth move, a task which is facilitated by White's perceptible superiority in development. First and foremost the long diagonal must be closed.
$11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
12 B-QKt5
B-Q2

Probably $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ is more logical, though after $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ White retains the initiative. $12 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ leads to inevitable exchanges, after which White's superiority grows very clear.

## 13 Q-R4 <br> Kt-Kı1

The only move. $13 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is met by $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! (but not $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; and 16 $\ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1), \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3 ; 15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $B \times B ; 16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, and Black gets no compensation whatever for the pawn. For that matter, now White's superi-
ority in development increases still more.

| $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| 16 Q-R4 |  |

16 Q-R4
Keeping the Black Knight from QB3 and also threatening $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$. Black is forced to offer the exchange of Bishops.

| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 18 QR-QB1 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| 19 Q-B2 |  |

Position after White's 19th move


With this move White hinders $19 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ and also firmly captures both the open files. Black's Knight is badly posted, and it is difficult to bring it into play. These factors permit the conclusion that Black has a lost position and White has only to find a good plan for exploiting his superiority.
If Black now attempts to wait on events with $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, after 20 Q-B5 and 21 Q-K6 an endgame unfavourable to him is forced.
19 ...
R-K2

Now also a quite joyless endgame for Black is forced.
$20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
$Q \times R$
21 Q-B7
$Q \times Q$

Of course the exchange is forced; the White Queen occupies too strong a position at B7.
: $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$
P-B3!

Well played. The White Rook will ive to retire from the seventh rank, id that relieves Black's situation a tle. Obviously, White should not Jw play $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7}$, R-B1!; 24 $-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$ and the QB file is aominated by Black.

| 23 | K-B1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 | R-B8 ch |
| 25 | R-B3! |

An intriguing situation! Black cannot move a single piece. Whether he plays $25 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, or $25 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, or $25 \ldots$, K-B2 White replies $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ with advantage. Black's last chance is to bring the King into the centre. To do this he must advance the KKtP and KRP from his second rank.
25 ...
P-KKt4
$26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ P-KR4

It seems as though Black has escaped the direct threats. Now there is nothing in $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; 28 R-B7 ch, K-K3; 29 R-KR7, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; but now White exploits the weakening of the Black's K side.
It has also to be noted that Black could not save the game with the continuation: $26 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$; 27 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; 28 Kt K 3 , K-K3; $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$ ! followed by $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$. 27 P-KR4!

Position after White's 27th move


A highly unpleasant move; $27 \ldots$. $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ is followed by $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$. Alekhine rejected $27 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ as he was afraid of the variation: $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$; $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$. I did not regard this variation as very convincing, so I proposed to follow $27 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ with $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ !, P-Kt5; $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$, K-K3; $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $31 \mathrm{P}-$ KKt3 (or $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ), K-K5; $32 \mathrm{Kt}-$ B 4 , and Black's position is unenviable.

| 27 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 30 Kt K1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |
| 31 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |

Otherwise $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, but now Black will be finally in zugszwang. There is not even any point in White winning a pawn by playing $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$.

| 32 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ |
| 34 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 36 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |

A trap: if $39 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, then $39 \ldots$. $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ and $40 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| 39 R-Kt6 | K-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 Kt-K5 | Kt-R3 |

White's game is won just as he wishes.
$41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch}$
K-B1
$42 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$

At last the "harvest" begins. White comes out with at least two extra pawns.

| 42 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 43 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| 44 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 45 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 46 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

## $47 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ <br> R-QB3

Also hopeless is $47 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 48 R-KB5, K-Kt2; 49 R-B6, KB2; 50 P-KR5.

| $48 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt5}$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $49 \mathrm{R} \times \operatorname{KtP}(5)$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| $50 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |  |

$50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ ! is weaker.

| $50 \ldots$ | $R \times R P$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | Resigns |

No. 59. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| Botvinnik (White) | Capablanca <br> (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt5 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |

The Nimzo-Indian Defence is not to be refuted in this way, but recent practice has shown that it is doubtful whether there is any refutation. With 4 P-K3 White aims only at consolidating his centre, hoping that a strong centre will be useful to him in the middle-game.
4 ...
P-Q4
So "theory" recommends, but this game shows that the move has certain disadvantages. If $4 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ the variation $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch; $6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ might be disadvantageous to White because of the QBP's weakness; but now White can take this continuation, for the QBP can always be exchanged.
5 P-QR3
B $\times \mathrm{Ktch}$

If $5 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$, then $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and the result is one of the positions arising out of the Queen's Gambit Declined, but with the extra move P-QR3 for White.

$$
6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4
$$

The most natural. White's basic

One of those games which have no brilliant moves whatever; every move seems very simple, yet it is impossible to cut out any one of them, for they are all closely interlocked.
Of course the difficulty of creating such a game lies not in the complexity of calculation involved, but that, when calculating, the position arising must be soundly appraised.
plan is later to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, then $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, and break through in the centre. This will not be easy to carry through if Black in his turn organizes pressure on White's QP, which his sixth move is calculated to do.

$$
7 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

A debated question is how to recapture the QP. Black decides to take with a pawn, in order to make P-K4 almost impossible for White.

| $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |

So far the game recalls that between Lilienthal and Ragozin, Moscow, 1935, but in that game White had already played P-KB3. With the system White has adopted in this game he does not need to play this necessary move in the opening: a very important circumstance.

The piece most unpleasant for Black is the Bishop at Q3, so he plays to exchange it.
$9 \ldots$
P-QKt3
10 O-O
B-R3
$11 B \times B$

Perhaps the Bishop should have been kept and retired to B 2 , but the Black Bishop at QR3 is then quite strong. But if Bishops are to be exchanged, it is best to do so as in the game, for it is difficult for Black's Knight at QR3 to reach the strong square QB 5 .

We may note, by the way, that after this game all this variation was checked in practice again and again, with changing fortunes for both sides.
$11 \ldots$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$
12 B-Kt2
Passively played. Of course the sound move is $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ !, forcing $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$.
$12 \ldots$ P-QR4
It is difficult for White to correct his inexact play of the last move. 13 Q-Q3 would be met by $13 \ldots$, Q-R5!, so it is necessary to prepare 14 Q-Q3.

$$
13 \ldots \quad \text { KR-K1 }
$$

A surprising mistake for Capablanca to make. It was not at all difficult to find the continuation $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ! and after $14 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$, KR-B1 White has difficulties along the QB file. However, White would probably have sufficient resources available for his defence.

$$
14 \text { Q-Q3 } \quad \text { P-B5 }
$$

Position after Black's 14th move


This is a really serious positional blunder. Black evidently assumed that White would be unable to advance the KP later, and Black's superiority would tell on the Q side. Capablanca had in mind the man-
œuvre Kt-QKt1-QB3-QR4-QKt6, after which it is difficult for White to defend the QRP.

However, Black's superiority on the Q side happens in this case to be of no great consequence, and the break-through $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ proves inevitable. Black should have contented himself with the modest defence $14 \ldots$, Q-Kt2.

| 15 Q-B2 | Kt-Kt1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 QR-K1 |  |

Psychologically understandable: White aims to show that he has no intention of defending the QRP at all. To be fair one must point out that this pawn could be saved easily by $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, and the play would be equal.
Even so it would have been more exact for White to play $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, preventing $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$.R4.
$16 \ldots \quad$ Kt-B3
Black mistakenly assumes that the struggle will be decided by his winning the QRP, otherwise he was bound to play $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ! preventing $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ (the Knight exchange is disadvantageous to White). If $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ (Romanovsky suggested this move) the game would take a more complicated turn, e.g.: $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$, P-B4; 18 B-B1, Kt-QB3; 19 P-B3, Kt-QR4; 20 P-Kt4, BP $\times$ P; 21 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$, and Black's position on the K side gives cause for anxiety.

## $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$

An interesting moment: Black cannot in any way prevent the breakthrough $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. If $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ White would temporarily transfer his Knight to R1!

| 18 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 20 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |

20 ..., Kt-B4; 21 R-K2! leads to loss of the piece.

## 21 Q-B2

Forced because of the threat 21 .., Kt-B4; but the Queen transfer to the K side comes into White's plan. Now Black must defend himself against Kt-B5-Q5, and against the advance of the KBP. Black's pieces cannot come quickly to their King's aid; and at the moment it is still far to the exploitation of his extra pawn. With his next manœuvre Capablanca gains the opening up of the K file, in the hope that simplification will be to his advantage.

| 21 | P-Kt3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ e.p. |  |  |

The only way to continue the attack.

| 23 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |  |

Position after White's 25th move


25
R-K1
What follows will be forced. Black indirectly defends the Knight at B3 (26 P $\times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ ) but this is insufficient.

Could he save the game with $25 \ldots$, R-KB1? I think not. Here are the possible variations:
(1) $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$; 26 Q-B4! $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7$; $27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ !, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ (27 $\ldots$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 28 Q-Kt5); $28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $30 \mathrm{Q}-$ R6, R-B2; $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch, and 32 R-K8 ch.
(2) $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$; $26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$, Q-Q2; 27 R-K6, Kt-R4 (or $27 \ldots$. Kt-K5; 28 Q-K5, Kt×Kt; 29 R-K7); 28 B-R3, R-B2; 29 Q-Kt5!
The second is the better, but it is doubtful whether even in this case Black could save the game.

## 26 R-K6! <br> $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$

The only move. $26 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ dis. ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}(28 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 29$ Q-B7 ch, K-Q1; 30 P-Kt7); 29 Q-B5 ch, K-Kt2; $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2 ; 31$ P-R4, R-KKt1; 32 P-Kt4, Q-B3; 33 B-R3! leads to immediate mate.
But now White gets a threatening pawn at K6.
$27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$
K-Kt2
28 Q-B4!
Q-K1

To prevent $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 30 Q-Kt5 ch.

29 Q-K5
Q-K2

Position after Black's 29th move


Black meets White's aims halfway, but in any case $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ was inevitable. E.g. after $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-R4; $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ !! (a threat of $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$
or 31 Q-B7 ch followed by $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6$ ) Black is forced to play $30 \ldots$, Q-K2 and White would follow the same combination as in the game.

| 30 B-R3!! | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Naturally, 30 | $\ldots$, |
| Q-B7 ch, K-K1; | 31 |
| Qt1; | 32 | Q-B7 ch, K-Kt1; 32 B-K7, Kt$\mathrm{Kt5} ; 33 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ is not much better.

$31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}!\quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; \quad 33 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q}-$
Q7 ch; $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} \mathrm{ch}$;
$35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ ch; $36 \mathrm{Kt}-$ Kt4 ch!
$\begin{array}{ll}32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5} \mathrm{ch} & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1 \\ 33 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Ktch} & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}\end{array}$
If $33 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ White mates in two moves.
34 P-K7!
Only thus. It would be a mistake
to play $34 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $35 \mathrm{P}-$ K7, Q-B8 ch; $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$; $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} \mathrm{ch} ; 38 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $39 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ch and the draw is inevitable. But now the $Q$ pawn is defended, and Black cannot resort to perpetual check.

| 34 | Q-B8 ch |
| :---: | :---: |
| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | Q-B7 ch |
| $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | Q-Q6 ch |
| $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | Q-K5 ch |
| $38 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Q-K7 ch |
| $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | Q-K5 ch |

## 40 P-Kt4

Even here care is needed: e.g. if 40 K-R3, then 40 ..., P-KR4!! and because of the threat $41 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ch a draw is inevitable.
$40 \ldots$ K-R5
Q-K8 ch
Resigns

## NINETEEN THIRTY-NINE

In the spring of this year the finals of the tournament for the U.S.S.R. Eleventh Championship were played at Leningrad. The finish was exceptionally interesting. Before the last round Kotov and I had the same number of points; we met in this round, and he played White. Need I say that very many people wished to watch this game? The two halls of the House of Physical Culture were filled before it began. For those who were "unfortunate" the organizers set up a demonstration board on the embankment of the River Moika. The spectators were "accommodated" on the opposite side of the river also, and all traffic came to a standstill.
I managed to win this dramatic game (No. 64) and thus recovered the title of Soviet Champion.
From the creative aspect I played very successfully all through the championship, having a number of good games.
Here I must also mention the book of the games of this championship, which was published three months later. Ragozin and I jointly annotated some thirty games.
In an article printed in that volume I openly detailed my methods of preparing for contests, something which I think no chess master had ever done before. As ten years have passed since then and there has been no falling off in my successes, evidently I do not need to conceal my methods! But the results are a different matter!

## U.S.S.R. ELEVENTH CHAMPIONSHIP

No. 60. Grünfeld Defence

| A. Tolush | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |  |

6 R-B1
This strong move was played by Capablanca against Reshevsky in the second round of the Amsterdam 1938 tournament.

Capablanca did not arrive at this continuation straightway. In earlier games of the same tournament, against me and Flohr he had played 6 Q-Kt3; and only when he was convinced that this does not give White superiority did he find $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$, so strengthening the entire variation in White's favour.
In this variation (with the White Bishop developed to B4) Black's basic opening problem is associated with P-QB4. If Black manages to achieve this painlessly he at once gets an equal game. The advantage of $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ consists in the fact that $6 \ldots$, P-B4 is made difficult to the maximum.

## $6 \ldots \quad$ P-B4

And none the less! Thus Reshevsky also played against Capablanca, and after $7 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; 8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP} \quad$ Black gained at least equality. Until this game I had never analysed $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$, as I was influenced by the game I have mentioned. But the moment Tolush unhesitatingly played $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ it was clear that he had found some new "strong resource." Before making my sixth move I had to recall the Amsterdam Tournament and tho-
roughly analyse the position. I came to the conclusion that White had the ketter chances, but, moved by curiosity, I decided to repeat all Reshevsky's moves, for I was deeply interested to find out what Tolush's discovery was.

$$
7 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B P} \quad \text { Q-R4 }
$$

Position after Black's 7th move


In a later game against Ragozin (Game No. 67 infra) I managed to find the stronger continuation for Black of $7 \ldots$, B-K3! Since then Capablanca's $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is played more and more rarely in tournaments.
$8 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
R-Q1
9 Q-Q2

This is Tolush's "improvement." However, when making his analyses he saw by no means all the finesses. Now White gets an inferior game.
None the less Tolush did a service in drawing attention to this position, which really did provide great scope for analytical research.
Thus, here was found the move 9 B-B4, highly unpleasant to Black, defending the Q5 pawn (it was this move I was afraid of at the board). It was not easy for Black to find a sound continuation, if one exists at all.
9 ...
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$

## 10 B-B7

Beautiful, and that's all! Of course $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $11 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch would be to Black's advantage.
10 ..
$\mathbf{Q} \times$ B
$11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !

In all probability Tolush did not foresee this shrewd yet inviting sacrifice of the exchange. White is left hopelessly behind in development, and the Black pieces come into play with gains of tempo.

White counted only on $11 \ldots$, Q-Q2; $12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ! or $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ! and in both cases he should win.
$12 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$
B-K3
Inadequate is $12 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$; 13 R-B2, B-K3; 14 Q-Q2, and Black must lose time in withdrawing his Bishop, and in this particular situation "delay is death." Black had another, possibly still stronger continuation, at his disposal: 12 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, continuing after $13 \mathrm{Q}-$ Q2 with $13 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ !, or if $13 \mathrm{~B}-$ B 4 , then $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$. But this latter variation called for calculation, and I was afraid of squandering the time, which might be required in later complications.
White must withdraw his Queen to Q2, for $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is followed by $13 \ldots, B \times K t P$.

| 13 Q-Q2 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 14 R-Q1 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

To meet the unpleasant threat of 14 . . .,.R-Q1; e.g. 14 B-B4, R-Q1; 15 Q-B2, Q-R4 ch; $16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-$ Q7; or $14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $15 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ ( $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ), $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $16 \mathrm{R}-$ Q1, Q-R4 ch; $17 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ (also possible is $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 18 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, B-B5; $19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 20$ $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}, \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8$ mate); $18 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and White is in a bad way. The pieces on the $K$ side will not be
able to come to the King's aid, so White mobilizes the Rook for defence.
However, he should have played $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and if $14 \ldots$, R-Q1, then $15 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$. If $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is followed by $14 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, White can count on achieving equality. But if $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, R-Q1; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-$ Q4, B $\times P$ (or B-B4) White's situation remains difficult.

Even so, in view of this possibility (14 R-B3) Black should probably have played $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and not $12 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$.

| $14 \ldots$ | R-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 Q-B1 | Q-R4 ch |
| 16 R-Q2 | R-Q4! |

## Position after Black's 16th move



The most energetic! White will be forced to surrender all the pawns on his Q side. If $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, Black plays $17 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$; 19 Q-R1, R-B7; $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$.
$17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

$$
\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}
$$

$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Less clear is $18 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 19 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ and Black has only two pawns to compensate for the loss of the more valuable Rook.
$19 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$
$20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K}+2$

If 20 Q-Ktl the same reply would follow.

## 20 ... <br> R-R6

With the murderous threat of $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP}$, after which the White King, stranded in the centre, would be defenceless.

| 21 | Q-Kt5 | Q-B6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Q-Kt2 | Q-B4 |

Black continues to attack the RP. Obviously $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 8$ ch; 24 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 25 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{ch} ; 27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$ ch!; $28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; 29 Q-B8 ch, K-Kt2; $30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, R-K7 leads to swift defeat.
$\begin{array}{ll}23 & \text { Q-Kt1 } \\ 24 \times B & B \times P\end{array}$
There is nothing better.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8$ |
| $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ |  |

$27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$
The two linked passed pawns should give Black a simple win. By retaining the Knight it would be easy to get the pawns queened. The continuation actually chosen, provoking an exchange of minor pieces, seems rather risky, but, as will be seen, it is the simpler road to victory. 27 ...

$$
\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4
$$

## No. 61. French Defence

| I. Rabinovich (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt5 |
| 4 P-K5 | P-QB4 |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$ |

The master V. Rauzer has performed exceptional service in thoroughly analyzing for White this variation of the French Defence.

From about the year 1924, the

| 28 | K-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 | B-Q3 |
| 30 | R $\times$ Kt |

If White succeeded in developing his pieces while Black's pawns remained at QR2 and QKt2, he would have chances of a draw, for the Black King is cut off from the $Q$ side, and the two Rooks would hold up the enemy pawns. But as the King, and the Rook at Q3 are posted very awkwardly, Black succeeds in advancing his infantry quite a long distance.

## 31 KR-Q1 Q-B5

The RP and KtP should be advanced together.

| 32 | K-B3 | P-QKt4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | R-Q7 | P-Kt5 |

If, now, $R \times P$, then $34 \ldots$, P-QKt6 followed by P-R5-R6, and Black queens the pawn.
34 R-QR7 P-QR5
The bad position of the White King facilitates Biack's win.

| 35 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 36 | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{QR} 8$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ |
|  | Q-Kt4 |

White resigns. If $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5$ Black plays $38 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \mathrm{ch}$; and then the KtP advances to be queened.
time of the Lasker-Maroczy game (New York, 1924) here $5 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ was always played, until in 1933 Rauzer demonstrated that White, by playing $6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ could get the stronger attack.

## $6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$

$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
Rauzer investigated this position also. In 1934 he proposed $7 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, which leads to very sharp play. This move frightened some players so much that they even rejected the defence $6 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ in favour of
$6 \ldots$, Q-B2; in the latter case the continuation $7 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ is less dangerous because of $7 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$.
In the Alexander-Botvinnik game, 1946, White was able to confirm Rauzer's view that after 6
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ the attack $7 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $8 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $9 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ is very dangerous. So in a rather later game against Reshevsky (Moscow, 1946) I continued 5 .... B-R4.

## $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$

The system of development associated with this move is also due to Rauzer. In reality, is White obliged to force the game? He has the freer position and two Bishops; he can, if necessary, exploit the Q6 square. The defect of his position is in the doubled QB pawns; at a convenient moment Black plays P-QB5, closing the position, and then the twoBishop superiority will be imperceptible.

For this reason is not the entire variation ideal for Black, as viewed by a present-day player? A game with counter-chances adequately cancels out the advantage of first move.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 7 \ldots \\
& 8 \text { B-Q3 }
\end{aligned} \quad \text { QKt-B3 }
$$

Now Black can play P-B5 with gain of tempo; with 8 B-K2 White does not lose a tempo, but then Black need not hurry with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
8 ...

Q-R4

## 9 Q-Q2

Obviously, White does not want a draw: $9 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} ; 10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, Q-Kt7; 11 R-Kt1, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP} ; \quad 12$ R-QR1.

| $9 \ldots$ | P-B5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

A fundamental error. Here much stronger is the continuation $10 \ldots$, Q-R5, which I took in the later game with Pogrebyssky (see Game

No. 63 infra) for it prevents White's 11 P-QR4. But now White's Bishop reaches QR3, and Black has a difficult game.

| 11 | P-QR4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |

Bad is $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP} ; 13 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, and hardly better is $12 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; $13 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$.
$13 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
Kt -B4
Of course, Black is not averse from consolidating his Knight at B4. But the preliminary $13 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ is bad because of $14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, and Black lacks the necessary $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, possible with the pawn at R2.
$\mathrm{R}-(\mathrm{Q} 1)-\mathrm{KB} 1-\mathrm{B} 2$ was worth considering, for a Rook at B2 is better posted than at Q1. During the game I did not study this continuation.

During play there were many (including myself) who thought 13 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ was a mistake, as, by replying $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, White could drive the Knight back, in other words, win a tempo. But afterwards I came to the conclusion that $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is quite logical. White is forced to weaken his position with $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ (otherwise, $14 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ ), and in such a position such a weakening is more fundamental than the loss of one tempo.
It must also be said that the position of the pawns on the QB file makes it very difficult for White to manœuvre; his $\mathbf{Q}$ side communicates with the K side only on the back rank (QB1).

```
\(14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4\)
\(\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 4)-\mathrm{K} 2\)
15 KR-Kt1
Q-R3
```

Now this is unnecessary! In fact White is still not threatening at all; doubling the Rooks on the Kt file would have no sense, as the Black KtP is safely defended. The sound
move is $15 \ldots, R(Q 1)-K B 1$, and the weakening of the B 4 square would soon have its effect. But now Black gets into a difficult situation.

## 16 P-R5!

Position after White's 16th move


Beautifully played! As of course the RP cannot be taken, the Black Queen is in a trap. This gives the game quite a new direction. The combinational threat $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1-\mathrm{Q} 3$ !B5 forces both sides to switch over to a consideration of definite variations.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 16 \ldots \\
& 17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1
\end{aligned} \quad \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 1)-\mathrm{KB} 1
$$

Very many critics criticized Rabinovich for this move. They all (including myself) assumed that White's game is easily won and that the simplest course was $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$. A closer study of the position leads to different conclusions: Black has considerable counter-play because of the weakness of White's KB4. He has only to resolve on a sacrifice of the exchange, in other words to choose the course he actually took after $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$. It seems to me that after $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 ; 19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$; or $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, one cannot assert that White's material advantage guarantees him victory.
$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
Perfectly logical, but unsound. Playing $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, White could not follow with the threat of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$. Alatortsev pointed out the sound variation $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ (here a sacrifice of the exchange is not permissible: after $18 \ldots$, Kt-Kt3; $19 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ KP; 21 P-B4 White has all the prospects of a win, because of the opening up of the game); $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ (not $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$ !), Kt-Kt3; 20 Q-K3 (again $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ is no use because of the same continuation), Kt-B5; 21 B B3. However, in my view Alatortsev was mistaken in considering tlat "the connection between Black's pieces is broken." In this variation also, after 21 ..., P-Kt4 all the struggle still lies ahead, though the unfortunate position of the Black Queen justifies the assumption that White has the better play.

Now White wins the exchange by force, but that unexpectedly leads him into difficulties.
$18 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Otherwise $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

| $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |

As Rabinovich pointed out, after $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ White would immediately win by way of $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ !, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; 23$ $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B} ; 24 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$, with the double threat: $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ and 25 R-R8 ch.
$21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$
$22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$

The position has been simplified. Despite White's superiority in material, his chances are inferior, for there are many weaknesses in his camp. The exchange he has prepared involves no change in estimate of the
position. $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ would be met by $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, and Black has the initiative.

| 22 | $\ldots$ | R-B5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |

25 R-K1
An inconspicuous error, which leads to a lost position for White. In no circumstances should he have allowed Black's $25 \ldots$..., P-K5, as after it he is condemned to passive defence.

For that matter, in the variation $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6$ (weaker is $25 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; 26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 29 \mathrm{Q}-$ Q4); 26 Q-Q4, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R P}$; White's situation is not easy, as there is a threat of Q-K2-R5, and if $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ Black plays $27 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ! $25 \ldots \quad$ P-K5

## Position after Black's 25th move



White's game is lost because of the weaknesses on the KB file and the existence of Black's passed QR pawn. However, before he can advance this pawn Black has to block the K side.

| 26 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| 27 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

White does not even have this possibility. All the difficulty of his situation consists in the fact that two pieces, apart from the King, are tied up in defence of squares KB2 and KB3, which makes him impotent against the threat of the advance of the QRP.
30 ...
B-K1
31 Q-K2

Now 31 P-B3 could be met by $31 \ldots$, B-Kt3 followed by the Bishop's transfer to K5.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | K-Kt1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | R-QKt1 | B-Kt4 |
| 33 | Q-K3 | B-K1 |
| 34 | Q-K2 | K-B2 |
| 35 | R-KR1 | B-Kt3 |
| 36 | R-K1 | B-K1 |
| 37 | R-KR1 | P-KR4! |

Just at the right moment! The pawn at R4 will greatly cramp White, while $38 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !; $39 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ leads to mate: $39 \ldots, R \times P$ ch; 40 K-Kt1, R-B8 ch; $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$, Q-B7 ch; $42 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, 43 R-Kt3, R-B7 ch; $44 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt}$; $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ mate.

| 38 K-Kt1 | B-Kt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 Q-K1 | P-R5 |
| 40 R-K3 | B-B5 |
| 41 R-R2 |  |

White intends to defend KB2 and KB3 with Rooks, and to stop the advance of the RP with his Queen. Probably the most expedient decision.

| $41 \ldots$ | P-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42 Q-R1 | Q-B1 |

Preventing 43 Q-R3.

| 43 | R-Kt2 | P-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | Q-R4 | Q-K2 |
| 45 | Q-R1 | K-Kt2 |
| 46 | Q-R4 | R-B1 |
| 47 | R-K1 | Q-Q3 |

White has no defence against $48 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ followed by $49 \ldots$, P-Kt4.


The only move! As pointed out above, a loss follows $51 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $52 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $53 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 54 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 8$ ! Now Black plays a waiting game, in order to gain time on the clock, and meanwhile transfers the King to a better position.

| $51 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 53 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

A mortal blow! White is forced to exchange Rooks, as if $60 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$, P-R5 there will be no stopping the RP , while $60 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ is followed by $60 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$ with the threat of $61 \ldots$, Q-R7 mate.

$$
60 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}!
$$

Decides at once. Here are the approximate variations:

No. 62. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik | I. Kann |
| :---: | :--- |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| $4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |  |

(1) $61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $62 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$, B-Kt7 ch; 63 K-Kt1, P-Kt5; 64 R-K1, P-KR6; 65 R-K5, P-R7 ch; $66 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $67 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP} \mathrm{ch}$, $K-B 2$, and there is no defence against the mate.
(2) $61 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$; $62 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt7} \mathrm{ch} ; 63 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch} ; 64$ $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! and the Queen endgame is hopeless, and after $65 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $66 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ the KtP is stopped by the Black King.
That is why it was necessary to transfer the King to B3.

| 61 R-R2 | P-R5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 62 K-Kt1 | P-R6 |
| 63 Q-B1 | B-B5 |
| 64 Q $\times$ KtP | P-R7 |
| 65 Q-B1 | P-K4 |

$66 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Forced; otherwise P-K5-K6 follows.

| $66 \ldots$ | $Q \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 67 | $Q-R 1$ |

White resigns, for he cannot avert 68 . ..., Q-B8 ch.

Strictly speaking, the "strongest" here (according to Tarrasch) is 4 Q B2. But $4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ leads to variations which have been less studied.

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
4 \ldots & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4 \\
\text { One of the strongest replies. } \\
5 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3 .
\end{array} \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \text { ch } . ~ \$
$$

$6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
Q-R4

Evidently Black did not like the variation 6 ..., P-Q4; 7 P-K3, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$. But the development of the Bishop to Kt 2 is playable here.

Now Black tries to facilitate his defence by exchanges.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
7 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \\
8 & \text { Q-B2 } &
\end{array}
$$

Necessary! After 8 P-K3, Kt $\times$ B; $9 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 10 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QK} \mathrm{t} 3$ ! Black easily obtains good play.
8 ...
$\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$
$9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
P-Q3
I think stronger here is $9 \ldots$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! and Black has good counterplay. $9 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ is too passive. 10 P-K3 P-K4

Position after Black's 10th move


This is the prime cause of all the later difficulties! Black unthinkingly weakens Q4, which may serve as a good base for the White pieces. In addition, Black loses an important tempo, necessary to his development. The right move is $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$.
$11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

A typical position. At first glance White has the inferior pawn structure, and so Black has nothing to fear. This would be correct if we could take all the pieces from the board. But there are still a lot of them left, and so the weakness of Black's Q4
is more serious than the doubled White QBPs. Moreover, these are even beneficial to White: the point is that to secure Q5 firmly White needs to advance his KP to K4, and then the doubled BPs will defend his Q4 against the Black pieces.

I have been able to prove the convenience of such a pawn arrangement in a number of games, e.g. with Sorokin (No. 20 supra), with Chekhover (No. 56, supra) and in a game against Panov, also played in the 11th U.S.S.R. Championship.

## 12 B-Q3 P-KR3

Otherwise Black cannot Castle, and in certain cases, if Black does not Castle, White can take the KRP.
$12 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ is inadvisable if only because of $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
13 O-O
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

This position too is highly instructive! White's natural plan consists in transferring the Knight to Q5. But if $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 15 KR-Q1, B-K3; $16 \mathrm{Kt-B1}, \mathrm{QR-Q1;}$ $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$, Kt-K2 White gains nothing of value. Q5 is in his power, but that is all. If he plays $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, Black exchanges the Bishop for the Knight and then transfers his Knight to Q3. But if White does not play Kt-Q5, an exchange of Rooks will take place along the open $Q$ file, and a draw becomes inevitable.
So White makes an attempt to liven up the game a little.
$14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
After $14 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ the game would be opened up (along the K file!) and White, being better developed, could exploit it before Black. $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is simpler, but Black has already thought of his next, mistaken move.

## 15 P-B5

Kt-B3
Maybe this is the decisive error! Black's move is directed against the
further advance of the KBP. But the right continuation is $15 \ldots$, P-B3, though, of course, in this case White's position is to be preferred, as the central squares K 4 and Q 5 are under his control, and greatly facilitate the manœuvring of his pieces.

Position after Black's 15 th move


Black rejects $15 \ldots$..., P-B3, but the result is that one of his pieces has to hold his KB3 all the time. But his chief trouble is that now White is able to exchange Knights, and then the White Bishop in the centre will dominate the board.

## 16 Kt-K4! <br> Q-Q1

Exploiting the fact that the QBP is invulnerable: $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$.

| $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| 19 QR-Q1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |
| 20 P-KR3 |  |

White's advantage is obvious, but he is still a long way from victory. E.g. the following variations lead nowhere:
(1) $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, B-Kt2; $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$, $B \times B ; 22 R \times B, Q R-Q 1!$
(2) $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1!} ; 23 \mathrm{R}-$ Q7, QR-Q1!

Similar variations are obtained from $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$. White wins a pawn, but the road to victory remains in
doubt. By opening up an escaperoute for the King, White strengthens all these variations. So Black avoids them and goes for the break-through P-Kt4.

| $20 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ |
| $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

The only sound move is $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! In this case, after $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, White would win a pawn, but because of the Bishop exchange the open QKt file would give Black counter-play. But now White keeps the Q5 Bishop, his chief hope, and at once Black is in a bad way.
23 P-B4
R-Kt3
24 R-Kt1
Preventing both Black's capture of the open QKt file, and the move 24 ..., B-Kt2.

$$
24 \ldots \text { R-Q1 }
$$

Black cannot capture the QKt file: $24 \ldots, \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Ktl}$ is met by $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ ! with the deadly threat of 27 Q-Kt6. If $25 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; (the relatively better continuation) then either $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$, or the more energetic 26 Q-R4, Q-K2; 27 P-B6, P $\times$ P; 28 Q-B2, K-Kt2; $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, with a strong attack. In this last variation there is nothing better for Black in $26 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 27 Q-R5, Q-K2; 28 P-B6, P $\times$ P (28 ..., $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6$ !, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP} ; 32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ ) ; $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$, and White also has good attacking possibilities.
$24 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ leads to a hopeless position.
$25 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$
Or $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ (not 26 P-B6, R $\times$ B; 27 R-Kt1, R-Q7), Q-B3; 27 P-K4.
26 P-K4

Parrying the threat $26 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$.
If $26 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$; then $27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt}$, winning a pawn.
$26 \ldots \quad B-B 1$

27 Q-R4
Otherwise with $27 \ldots$, B-Q2 Black would prevent this Queen transfer.

| 27 | $\ldots$ | B-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | Q-R7 | B-K1 |
| 29 | R-Kt1 | R-Q3 |
| 30 | P-QR4 |  |

Thus White wins a pawn, which at once decides the outcome.

| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $32 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ |  |

Of course, not $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, with complications.

| $32 \ldots$ | $R-R 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 | Q $\times$ BP |

No. 63. French Defence

| I. Pogrebyssky | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |

So far, as in the RabinovichBotvinnik game (No. 61, supra), where I mistakenly played $10 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, so allowing $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$. The advantage of the continuation $10 \ldots$, Q-R5 is that now White cannot easily play P-R4; and so his Queen's Bishop cannot reach Q6.

Now White could provoke $11 \ldots$, P-QKt3 with $11 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$, but that leaves matters substantially the same.

34 Q-K3
34 ..., Q-Kt4 could not be allowed.

| 34 | $\ldots$ | Q-R3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35 | R-Kt8 | Q-R5 |

36 K-R2
An important move! Black lacks one tempo for doubling his pieces on his 8th rank. $36 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ is most simply refuted by 37 Q-Kt3, R-R8; $38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8 ; 39$ Q-Kt6 ch!, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $40 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt8} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 41 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ dis. ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $42 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ mate.

| 36 | $\ldots$ | R-R6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | Q-B5 | R-R7 |
| 38 | R-R8 | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ |

Equivalent to resignation. $38 \ldots$, Q-B7; $39 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $40 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 7$ does not alter matters.

| $39 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $40 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $41 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | Resigns |
|  |  |
| $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |  |

A good move, to which Black's reply should probably have been $12 \ldots$, O-O, with an approximately equal game. After Black's instinctive reply White's game is perhaps just a little the better.

| $12 \ldots$ | P-KR3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

Position after Black's 13th move


Black cannot Castle short because of the manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4-\mathrm{R} 5 \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ! Black Castles long, but maybe 13 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ is sounder.

## 14 P-B4

Only now is it clear that White's good move $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ was made with a very bad idea behind it. It transpires that White intends via Kt-B2-Q1-QKt2 to get his RP into motion. It's not worth the trouble, too much precious time is spent on this manœuvre!

I was expecting $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, which would be followed by $14 \ldots, \mathrm{QR}-$ B1; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ ! and the play would be about equal. $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ suits Black, as it still further cramps White's Queen's Bishop.
$14 \ldots \quad$ P-B3
Black gets an excellent position for his Knight at KB4; in this variation it is the first symptom showing that White has chosen an unsound plan.

| 16 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |  |

$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ leads to an irreparable weakening of White's K side.
$17 \ldots \quad$ Q-R4 $\quad 18$ P-QR4 $\quad 1$

Here I had to consider also the variation 18 ..., B-K1; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, B-Kt3; 20 Q-K1, Kt(4) $\times$ QP; 21 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$; though Black gets three pawns for the piece, the position is rather in White's favour.

As $19 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{KP}!$ is not at the moment possible, White cannot prevent $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt5}$, after which the Bishop at K2 will be blocked.

Black has positionally a completely won game. The only question is where he should break through. I think on the $Q$ side, for here
the break-through is facilitated by White's awkward pawn position.
19 Kt -Q1
P-Kt5
$20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$

This eases Black's task; through Q3 his Knight can always get to K5. True, White wins a tempo for developing his Queen's Bishop, but this is now not so important, and so it would have been better to refrain from $20 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$. On the other hand, $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$ is too tedious ( $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}(4) \times \mathrm{QP}$; is immediately bad) and so is $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 21 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2!; 22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 23 Q-Q2, Kt-Q3.
20 ..
QR-B1
$21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$
$22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$

Position after Black's 22nd move


A positional blunder, after which the game is almost equalized! The White QB pawns will be parted, and Black's prospects on the $Q$ side amount to nothing, while White so far has no weaknesses on his K side. In addition, the Bishop at K2 returns to life. Black should have withdrawn his Queen to B2.

## $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ <br> Q-Kt3

$\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ at once is better.
24 P-B3 Q-B2
Black has only one hope of a win: to break through along the KR file. To do this he must provoke $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} \mathrm{K} 3$;
and this he aims at, organizing an attack on the KBP.

## $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$

$25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$ or even $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is obligatory here. The Knight is necessary to the defence of the $K$ side. At Kt 2 he is shut out of the game, and Black carries through his plan unhindered.

| $25 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{R} 1)-\mathrm{B} 1!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

The first part of Black's plan has been carried out; P-Kt3 has been forced. Now the Black pieces are transferred to the KR file.

| $27 \ldots$ | R-R1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | B-B2 | P-R5 |
| 29 | K-Kt2 | Kt-B4 |

Doubling the major pieces on the KR file is insufficient for victory;

No. 64. Ragozin's Defence

| A. Kotov | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

At the period of this game Kotov always played $4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ or $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$. But against me he chose $4 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and this was not a haphazard move. The point is that in a game against Makogonov I had adopted the system, for Black: $4 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and $5 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. It is obvious that White would find it very attractive to provoke me into these same variations, which theory reckoned to be in White's favour.

## $4 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt}$ - B3

Understandably the continuation
$4 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, which has been worked at in too great detail, did not suit
with the text move Black begins to clear his second rank for his Queen's passage to KR2.
$30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
This only facilitates Black's win, for it weakens K4.
$30 \ldots \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$
31 Q-K2
Loses at once. White does not even have time later on to sacrifice the exchange at K 4 .
$31 \ldots$
R(B4)-R4
32 R-R1
P-K4!

A tactical stroke consummating the struggle. The Bishop breaks into the opponent's camp.

| 33 | $\mathbf{Q P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | B-B4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | QR-KKt1 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 35 | K-B1 | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 36 | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |

Resigns
me, for by my position in the tournament I had to play to win this game.
$5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
P-Q4
6 P-K3

Makogonov continued $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Ktch} ; 7 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $8 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; and Black has a counter initiative. Kotov prefers to transpose the play from the Nimzo-Indian Defence to a well-known variation of Ragozin's Defence, which is generally regarded as favourable to White.

| 6 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch |
| $8 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |  |

So the result is Ragozin's Defence, with moves interchanged. ((1) P-Q4, P-Q4; $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$; $4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; 5 Q-B2, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} ; 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 8 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$.

This is a characteristic modern defence system against 1 P-Q4.

Black yields his opponent the advantage of two Bishops and goes for a rather cramped arrangement of his pieces. Why does he do all this? Basically for the sake of swift development. And in fact so far as Black is concerned the opening is ended, whereas White's development is still far from completion. Black is ready for any operation, while White must play with great caution, as he is lagging in development. E.g. 9 P-Kt4, P-R4!; 10 P-Kt5, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is bad; the play is opened up, and Black is already prepared for that.

With such a method of playing the opening, i.e. ignoring symmetrical moves and aiming at counter-play, the advantage of the move is less perceptible. This, in my view, is what present-day players aim at when playing Black.
9 P-QKt3
P-QR4

## $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$

The first inexact move!
Black's plan is quite simple: exploiting the fact that White has made the move $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, he aims to capture the white squares on the Q side. It is difficult to prevent this, but if $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ (followed by $13 \ldots, B-K t 4)$ the play is approximately equal. But now in the variation $10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 5$; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \quad$ Black gains an important tempo.
10 ..
P-R5
$11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
The second inexact move!
White did not like the variation indicated above, though it was perfectly playable. Black immediately exploits the weakening of pressure on the central square K 5 .
11 ...
R-K1
$12 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

A sound decision: White does not
prevent $12 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$. He is too backward in development to permit himself $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, which would involve a further weakening of the white squares. After 12 P-B4, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4 ; 13 \quad \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ White's K side arouses serious anxiety.

## 12 ... P-K4

Position after Black's 12th move

$13 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$
The third inexact move!
After 13 B-Kt2, P-K5; 14 B-K2, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ Black's superiority is undoubted, as he forcedly obtains an excellent base at Q4 for his pieces; but with this continuation events would develop at a slower tempo. Probably, in exchanging at K5 White intended to develop pressure on KKt 7 along the closed diagonal QR1-KR8. However, just the reverse happens: White has difficulties with the defence of his K side.

## $13 \ldots$ <br> $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$

## 14 B-Kt2

White cannot even dare to dream of keeping both his Bishops: $14 \mathrm{~B}-$ K 2 is followed by $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, $\mathrm{Q}-$ Kt 4 with an increasing attack.
For that matter, Black also has no intention of yielding his excellently centralized Knight so readily.

A very important move! White intended to play $15 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ with pressure along the Q file.
$15 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
The fourth inexact move, and this time decisive!

Black forces a won position. White rejected $15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, as then the Rook could not get to Q1 because of Black's reply B-R5. Even so White should have taken the pawn with the Queen.

## 15 ... Kt-K5!

Immediately exploiting the absence of the White Knight from the centre. Now White has only one reply. Both $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ followed by $17 \ldots$, Q-Kt4, and 16 Q-Q4, P-B4; $17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ are bad.

## 16 Q-B2 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$

Black intends to put pressure on White's KKt2. So the Bishop at Q3 must be exchanged off, and the remaining Bishops of opposite colours only facilitate Black's attack.

## $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 4) \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ <br> $18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ !

A threat of both $19 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ and $19 \ldots$, B-R6, winning the exchange in either case. To defend KKt2 with his Queen at QB2 White is forced to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and reconcile himself to a decisive weakening of his pawn structure, as it will be difficult to defend the KR1-QR8 diagonal.

Here it is not enough to play at once $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, in the hope of parrying $19 \ldots$, B-R6 with $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, for to $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ Black will continue 19 ..., B-R5; $20 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$ with an easy win.

## 19 P-B4 Q-Kt3

This position must be reckoned as won for Black. One can imagine the general astonishment when, annotating this game in the newspaper " 64 ," Belavenietz (who in general was one of the most outstanding of Soviet

Position after Black's 19th move

analysts) wrote that after $20 \mathrm{Q} \times$ QBP "there is nothing decisive apparent for Black," and backed up his opinion with a large number of variations! But in reality $20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ is followed by $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6 ; 21 \mathrm{Q}-$ B2, QR-B1; 22 Q-K2, Kt-Q3 (Belavenietz did not notice this move) and White can hardly save himself. For instance:
(1) $23 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1!, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6 ; 26$ $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtPch} ; 27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathbf{Q}$; 28 R-K1, B-B3.
(2) $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$.
(3) $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} t 5$; $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1$, Kt-K5; 25 R-KB1, R-B7; 26 QKt1, R-K7 (also possible: $26 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP} \mathrm{ch}$ ) .
(4) $23 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$.
(5) $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$.

With his next move White rebutts Black's threat of $20 \ldots$, B-K3; 21 Q-B2, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; and $22 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.
$20 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$
At all costs Black must avoid exchanging off his excellent Bishop. Thus, if $20 \ldots$. . B-B3; then 21 QB 2 , and if occasion offers, $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$. But now White cannot play $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ because of $21 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ !

| 21 Q-Q3 | B-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 Q-B3 | B-K5 |

Probably still stronger is $22 \ldots$, B-R6; 23 P-Kt3 (23 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3!), \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$, etc. But the text continuation is also quite convincing.

| 23 | R-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 | Q-Q3 |$\quad$ B-B3 1 Kt-B4

If $24 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$, then $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! But now, in addition to $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, there is a threat of $25 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 26 Q-B3, Kt-R5. White's next move is his only defence.

| 25 | B-K5 | P-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | B $\times$ QBP |  |

The more complicated continuation $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{QBP}$, R $\times$ P; 28 Q-Kt3, Q-B2; 29 B-Kt6, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ also would not save White.

| $26 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | Q-B4 ch | K-R1 |
| 28 | B-Kt6 | R(K6)-K1 |

The simplest! White must defend himself against $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$.
29 Q-KB1
P-R4
$30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$

Perhaps he should have resolved on $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$, B-K5. Black of course will readily exchange Knights, as that would strengthen the position of the Bishop at B3, especially as $30 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ is no good because of 31 Q-Q3! With the Knight exchange White is condemned to complete passivity.
30 ...
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$
$31 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
A little better is $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, preventing Black from playing 31 ..., R-K5.

32 R-K1
The only move! Otherwise there follows $32 \ldots, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1$, then $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ and $R-K 7$, and White's KKt2 is indefensible.

| $32 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R} 1$ |

Position after Black's 34th move


Both sides had little time for thought; this explains the inexact play which can easily be detected in recent moves of both Black and White.
Thus, White should not have withdrawn his King to KR1, while after this move Black could have won another pawn with $34 \ldots$, R-KB6.

However, this does not affect the estimate of the position: White cannot save the game.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2 & \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2 \\
36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3 & \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1
\end{array}
$$

37 Q-B2
White falls into an artful trap which Black had thought of at the 34th move. But even after the better 37 Q-Q2, R-Q1; 38 Q-K3, Q-B4; $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, he could not have put up any lengthy resistance.

It is an interesting fact that seven years later, in a game against Himar (Groningen, 1946) Kotov (remembering the foregoing game!) himself caught his opponent in a similar trap; with the sole difference that in the later game the pin was not along a diagonal, but along a vertical!

[^3]
## NINETEEN FORTY

So far as my performance in chess was concerned, this year was a mixture of good and bad. To begin with I succeeded in winning a match against Ragozin. This was of considerable importance, as hitherto I had been much weaker in match than in tournament play. Ragozin is a dangerous opponent, especially in match play, and so J had to put quite a lot of work into the match, and to think out "matich strategy and tactics" in detail, in order to win.
On the other hand, in this same year I suffered the bitterness of defeat in the U.S.S.R. Twelfth Championship, played at Moscow. During the first half of the tournament I did not do badly and was in the lead; but then I lost grip, and I finished only in the fifth-sixth places. Presumably I had not been sufficiently thorough in applying the methods of preparation which I myself had written about!
Three games from this tournament (from the first half, of course) are given in this collection.

## BOTVINNIK-RAGOZIN MATCH

May
No. 65. Slav Defence
3rd Game of Match

|  | Botvinnik <br> (White) | Ragozin <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

Since the eighth game of the Keres-Euwe match (1940), 3 ..., $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ is rarely played; the variation $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $6 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ is obviously in White's favour.

## 4 P-K3 <br> P-KKt3

With the order of moves White has chosen ( $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, and not $3 \mathrm{Kt}-$ $\mathrm{KB} 3), 4 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is bad because of $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $6 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$. But if Black does not wish to play $4 \ldots$, P-K3 either-it may lead to the Meran Variation-he cannot do better than play the Schlechter Variation (4..., P-KKt3).

[^4]| 6 | B-Q3 | O-O |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | O-O | B-Kt5 |

A dubious system of development in use 25 years ago. True, Black has solved the problem of development of the QB, but he leaves White the advantage of the pair of Bishops.

| $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

A positional error. White's two Bishops may be powerful if the game is opened, so Black should not have exchanged in the centre. $9 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ is more logical.
$10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$
QKt-Q2
$11 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$
P-K4

Bogoljubov, against Marshall (Baden-Baden, 1925) played 11 ..., Kt-K1, but did not equalize the game. The text move also is no novelty; it occurred in a BogoljubovRabinovich game, played in the U.S.S.R. Fourth Championship, Leningrad, 1925.
Now, of course, it is not in

White's interest to play $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; but he can operate on the Q file, with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$. This has the advantage that Black's Bishop remains blocked.

## $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ <br> P-B4

Position after Black's 12th move


Rabinovich played $12 \ldots$, Q-B2 and was left with an inferior game.

## 13 P-Q6

This move should be made before P-K4 as White, in attacking the QKtP with his Queen, gains a tempo.

| $13 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 14 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | the QP, but nothing comes of it. Moreover, even if he were to succeed, White would still have the better position, as he would control files for his own pieces. White's sole danger would arise if Black could transfer one of his Knights to Q5; but he cannet.


| 15 B-K3 | P-QR3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 P-QR4 | R-B1 |

Of course, neither now nor earlier could Black play $16 \ldots$, Q-Kt3, because of $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, and if $17 \ldots$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$, then $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KKt5}$, leading to capture of the Queen. ${ }^{1}$

## 17 R-Q2

P-R3
The attempt to win the pawn could still be refuted by various means. The simplest of all would be: 17 ..., R-B3; 18 QR-Q1, Kt-Kt3; $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}_{\text {, }}$ and White breaks through Black's front. Nor is the manœuvre Kt-Kt1-B3Q5 possible.

Black is preparing $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K})-$ B3, which if played at once would be dubious because of $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; in addition his aim is to transfer his K1 Knight through B3-R2-Kt4-K3 to Q5.
18 QR-Q1
Perhaps 18 Q-Q1 followed by $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 5$ and then $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is even stronger.
18
$\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{K} 1)-\mathrm{B} 3$
$19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
Firstly, with this move White prevents the Knight manœuvre abovementioned, and secondly, every exchange increases the strength of the QP.

| $19 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | Q-B3 |

This is a serious error. The QBP needs protection, so Black should have played $22 \ldots$, Q-R4, and although after 23 P-Kt3 all Black's pieces occupy passive positions, there is no obvious immediate threat to them. Even so, because of the pawn on Q6 White's win is only a question of time.
Now White could gain considerable superiority by $23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; 25 $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 1)-\mathrm{QB} 1$. But he prefers to keep the Q6 pawn and to exploit the weakness of Black's QB2.

[^5] $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ forestalls. S.G.

## 23 B-R2 <br> R(Kt1)-B1

Otherwise $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{QBP}$.

## 24 P-QKt4

Black has no way of defending the BP; so he is forced to let the White Rook penetrate to the seventh rank.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |

This of course speeds up the denouement, but it is obvious that against White's two powerful Bishops, the pawn on Q6, a Rook on the seventh rank, and equality in

## No. 66. English Opening 5th Game of Match

|  | Botvinnik <br> (White) | Ragozin <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | P-QB4 | P-K4 |
| 2 | Kt-QB3 | Kt-KB3 |
| 3 | Kt-B3 | Kt-B3 |
| 4 | P-Q4 | P-K5 |

The general attitude to this move is critical and rightly so. The advanced KP causes Black a good deal of trouble, and White has an easy game. Here $4 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is more circumspect.
$5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
B-Kt5

This move, which Ragozin also played against Riumin (Moscow, 1935) enables White to retain a strong pawn centre; more prudent is $5 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ as Flohr played against me in the fifth game of our match (Moscow, 1933).
6 P-K3
O-O
7 B-K2

In the above-mentioned game Riumin played 7 Q-B2, recaptured at B3 with his Queen and then Castled long-a course leading to double-edged chances. In the present game White pursues a different
material the "struggle" would not be very interesting.

## $26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

$26 \ldots$, Q-B3 could be met by 27 Q-B4.
$27 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$
28 Q-B4 R-B1
29 R-Q7
The rest is obvious. There is no escape.

| $29 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | Resigns |

plan: the immediate undermining of the KP, Black's one strong point in the centre.

$$
7 \ldots \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1
$$

Ragozin also played thus against Riumin; in that case it was obligatory, here perhaps he should have resolved on $7 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.

$$
8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}
$$

Sooner or later the exchange was necessary.

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \\
10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3 &
\end{array}
$$

White consistently pursues his attack on the KP. It transpires that Black cannot hold the centre: 10 $\ldots, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, and because of the double threat $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ followed by $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$ Black will have no time to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, consolidating K5 for himself. Even so perhaps he should have chosen this variation; he might have been a pawn down but he would have had counter-play.
10 ...
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

## $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !

White had this continuation in mind when he played $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$. The K 4 square has been won from Black.

If Black declines the pawn sacrifice with $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$, there follows $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and White retains the initiative. Black accepts the sacrifice, which is clearly imprudent, as White's Queen's Bishop will come into play with great force.

| $11 \ldots$ | $R \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

Naturally, $12 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ would also be followed by $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ ! and then $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, and Black would be quite helpless.

## 13 B-Kt5 <br> $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

Even so the doubling of pawns on the KB file cannot be avoided. White in his turn is in no hurry to exchange at KB6, for he does not want to simplify the play, and he exploits the lull to bring up reserves.

$$
14 \text { Q-Q2 } \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

$14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ would be followed by the KRP's march to the sixth, which leads to an easy win, while 14 $\ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ would be met by B-Q5! Black is forced to lose yet another move on defending his Q4 square and the QKtP.

## 15 QR-K1 <br> B-B4

Now if $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 16 B-R5 would be possible.

```
\(16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}\)
\(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}\)
```

It appears that Black has found a means of defence. After retiring the Bishop to Kt3 he intends to begin exchanges on the $K$ file.

## 17 P-KR4

This move places Black in a hopeless position. He has no foothold on the weakened K side; now after 18 B-Q1 White can begin to transfer pieces to that side.

| $17 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
$18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 19 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch and $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ leads to the loss of a piece.
19 B-Q1
Black's Bishop must move because of the threat of $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.

| $19 \ldots$ | B-K5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-Kt3 |
| $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

The only move, otherwise $22 \mathrm{P}-$ R5 and $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
$22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$
23 P-R5

Position after White's 23rd move

$23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ also wins. If Black replies $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ then $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q} ; \quad 25 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 26$ $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, and $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, and White has an extra pawn in the endgame. Of course the text move is more energetic.

If Black now plays $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-R5; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$; $25 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \mathrm{ch}$, he is defenceless. The continuation he chose is no better.
$\begin{array}{lll}23 & \text { Kt-B1 } \\ 24 & \text { Q-Kt3 ch } & \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2\end{array}$
Of course, not $24 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; 25 Q-K5 ch, and 26 R-K3, with the inevitable 27 R-Kt3 ch.

## $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \mathrm{ch}$ <br> B-B4 <br> 26 Q-B4

All that remains is to break down the last feeble barrier on the KB file.
$26 \ldots$
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

27 B-B2
Also possible is $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$; 28 Q-R2, Q-Kt4; 29 K-R1. White is suffering from time shortage, and he chooses another way.

$$
27 \ldots \quad \text { Q-QKt1 }
$$

No better is $27 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 28 Q-B7, Q-K2; $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; 30 Q $\times$ KtP.
28 Q-R6

> Q-Kt1

No. 67. Grünfeld Defence

| 8th Game of Match |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ragozin <br> (White) | Botvinnik (Black) |
| 1 | P-Q4 | Kt-KB3 |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-KKt3 |
| 3 | Kt -QB3 | P-Q4 |
| 4 | B-B4 | B-Kt2 |
| 5 | P-K3 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 6 | R-B1 |  |

Capablanca was the originator of this manœuvre (Capablanca-Reshevsky, Amsterdam, 1938). The idea is to make it as difficult as possible for Black to play P-QB4. It was already established that if $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B4}$; $7 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, with 9 B-B4! White can create great difficulties for Black (9 ..., B-K3; 10 K-K2). Evidently, that was how White intended to continue here; however, a slight disillusionment awaited him.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 \ldots \\
& \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}
\end{aligned} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4
$$

When preparing for this game I made a critical study of Reshevsky's play, and after several trials I hit upon this move. Instead of sacrificing the QP, and then recapturing with difficulty, Black defends it in advance. It is not expedient for White to exchange at his Q5, as that surrenders the initiative to Black.

If $28 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$, or 31 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and Black is in a bad way.

| $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
|  | Resigns |

$32 \ldots$. K-Q3 is followed by $33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch! After Black accepted the Pawn's sacrifice White's pressure increased gradually but inexorably.

Position after White's 7th move

7 ...
B-K3

Black's immediate task is the rapid development of all his forces; this is much more difficult for White.
$8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$9 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$

White forestalls $9 \ldots$..., Q-R4 but in doing so loses precious time. Perhaps it would have been better to play $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ at once.
Black has completed the development of his minor pieces, and immediately turns to active operations.
9 ...
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$
$10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$
White must play with great caution. Bad is $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; and then $11 \ldots, \mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{K}$ t ; also $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$, with the threat of $12 \ldots, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R P}$. Now

White plans to complete his development, and $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ cannot give Black superiority. How should he continue?
$10 \ldots$

## $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch

It was difficult to decide on giving up the excellent Bishop, but the possible variations confirm the soundness of the exchange. By destroying the Knight and retaining his own centralized Knight, Black gains a great advantage in the centre, which is bound to influence later events.

## $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

As $12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{B} 5)$; 13 Q $\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}(14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$, Kt-Q6 ch), Q-Q6; $15 \mathrm{Kt-Kt1}$, R-Q1 leads to mate, and the B5 pawn cannot be defended, Black has every hope of coming out with an extra pawn. E.g. after $12 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{B} 5) ; 13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; 14$ $B \times P, \quad Q \times Q ; \quad 15 \quad B \times Q, \quad B \times R P$ White is a pawn down. Even so, Castling was White's best course.
12 Kt -Q4 B-Q4
The simplest; because of the threat $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $B \times K t$, White must retreat.

## 13 B-R6 R-K1

Very attractive here is $13 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ followed by $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$; or $13 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ and $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$. But if $13 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ White would reply $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 15 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}!, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P}$ thus even getting the better game.

| 14 O-O | P-K4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| Otherwise 15 | Q-R5 follows. |
| 15 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{B} 5)$ |
| 16 Q-Kt5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

Black had a choice between the variation $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$,
$\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{RP}$, and the text continuation, which leads to an unexpected sharpening of tension, as White is able to pin Black's pieces on the Q file. However, Black has grown so strong in the centre that he need not be afraid of the pin. Of course $17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ is not possible now because of $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$.

## 17 KR-Q1

Concerning 17 QR-Q1 see the note to Black's 19th move.
Now Black has no time to play $17 \ldots$, P-K5 because of $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, and so he first defends the QB5 pawn.

| $17 \ldots$ | P-R3 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 Q-Kt1 | P-QKt4 |  |
| 19 | B-Kt5 | Q-Q2 |

The decisive move! The threat $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is irrefutable. If White himself plays $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, then follows $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, and after 21 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ (22 R-B7, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 5), \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{B} 3)$ White has lost three pawns; bad also is $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch.
So, in retrospect, would it not have been better for White to play 17 $R(Q B 1)-Q 1$, and then via the variation $17 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3 ; 18$ Q-Ktl, P-QKt4; 19 B-Kt5, Q-Q2; 20 P$\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, to continue $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $23 \mathrm{Q} \times$ Kt , perhaps even getting the better game? But this variation would not have arisen. Black would have played $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3!$; $20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$, P-K5; $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$; $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, Kt-B4; 25 R-B7, Q-K4, and White loses the exchange.

| $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

To reply to $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ with 22 ..., R-R4.
$\begin{array}{lll}22 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4 & \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \\ 23 & \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{Kt} & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6\end{array}$

## 24 Q-B2

$24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ is also hopeless, of course; besides the extra pawn Black has a dominating position. The question involuntarily arises, what was White hoping for? The explanation is quite simple: Black was under acute time pressure. Perhaps he played his next few moves not quite exactly, but he did not let the victory slip out of his hands.

| 24 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7$ |
| 26 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{K} 1)-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7}$ |
| 30 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 8$ |
| 34 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ |

White was reckoning that Black
No. 68. Ruy Lopez
10th Game of Match

| Ragozin (White) | Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-QB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | P-QR3 |
| 4 B-R4 | Kt-B3 |
| $5 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | B-K2 |
| $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | P-QKt4 |
| 7 B-Kt3 | P-Q3 |
| $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | O-O |
| 9 P-KR3 | Kt-QR4 |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | P-B4 |
| $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Q-B2 |
| $12 \mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-B3 |
| $14 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{KB1}$ |  |

All this has been met with often enough before. The continuation $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ is admitted to be the best for White. However, he chooses
would continue either $35 \ldots, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q P}$ (then $36 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, getting rid of that troublesome pawn) or $35 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times$ QP, which would be followed by 36 Q-K7, B-B2 (36 ..., Q-Kt2; $37 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ ); $37 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, winning back the exchange and the pawn.
36 B-B4 $\quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
37 B-K6 ch
Black also loses after $37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 38 Q-K6ch, K-Kt2; 39 Q-Q7 ch, K-R1; 40 B-R6, R-R8 ch!; $41 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ ch; and $43 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times$ B at R6.

| $37 \ldots$ | K-R1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 | P-Q6 |
| 39 | Q $\times$ R |

In this position White sealed 41 P-R5, but he decided not to resume.

A game crammed with interesting variations.
another, long familiar continuation, which was played as long ago as in the Lasker-Tarrasch match, Munich, 1908, and is associated with the sacrifice of the QP.

| $14 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 B-B4 |  |

Recommended by Tartakower. The same move was played in a Kasparian-Panov game (Tbilisi, 1937).

## $15 \ldots$ <br> Q-Kt3 <br> 16 P-K5

From this point Black has a good game. One cannot understand why White avoided the plan $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt3}-\mathrm{B} 5$, which Kasparian used successfully in the game already mentioned. The exchange of the KP for the Black pawn on Q3 should have been made only when this forced definite advantages for White. But now Black
has won a pawn without any adverse effects.

| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times P$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

Developing the QB and covering the KB . The QP is invulnerable ( $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ) and because the Bishop at B2 hangs $19 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ is not possible.

| $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 20 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

An attempt to play for a draw with $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ is easily refuted: 21 ..., R-K1; 22 B-K5, QR-Q1; 23 B-B7, R-QB1; 24 B-K5, KR-Q1.

## 21 Q-Q3

Position after White's 21st move


Shrewd, yet surprisingly enough leads to a loss. True, after this move Black had to calculate quite a number of long variations.
21 ...
B-B5
$22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$

The whole point. White compelled $21 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$ by threatening $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and now he has captured Black's central passed pawn, so restoring equality of material.
$22 \ldots$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$
$23 B \times Q$

$$
\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}
$$

The only move, leading to retention of his advantage.
$24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$
B $\times$ R $\mathbf{P}$

Unexpected, as the Bishop would appear to be shut out of play and caught in a trap. However, Black's pieces manage to come to its rescue in time, and the resulting endgame with an extra pawn is not so difficult technically.

## $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$

$25 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 ; 26 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $28 \mathrm{~B}-$ B 2 only leads to a draw.

With his next move White must pin the Knight, otherwise $26 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ will follow, and the Bishop is protected.
26 R-Q7 Kt-B6
It can be accepted that the first attack on the Bishop has been repulsed!
$27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$

| Otherwise $27 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

Position after Black's 28th move


It is now clear that the Bishop is still invulnerable; if $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, P-B4; $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 ; 31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 1$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8$; $\quad 32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} \quad$ White seemingly cannot avoid defeat.

## 29 B-K4 <br> $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t P}$

Black's pieces appear to be in a dangerous situation, but it transpires

NINETEEN FORTY

| that White is unable to exploit the | $34 \mathrm{Kt-Q2}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| circumstance. E.g. $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; | $35 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt7}$ | Kt-Q4 |
| 31 B-Q5, P-Kt5; 32 R-B2, B-Kt8; | $36 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt2}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$; or $32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, | 37 P-B4 | P-Kt3 |
| $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $33 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, and in both | $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | B-R7 |
| cases White should lose. | $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | P-Kt5 |
| $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $40 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | B-K3 |
| $31 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 8$ |  |  |

At this point the game was adjourned. White sealed $41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, but did not resume play. Black's pieces co-operated in great harmony.

## U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP

September

No. 69. King's Indian Defence

|  | Botvinnik <br> (White) | Boleslavsky <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

After a number of games played by Boleslavsky and Bronstein we all know how many finesses are concealed in this opening. But when this game was played (it was my first meeting with Boleslavsky) all one knew was that the Kiev players ${ }^{1}$ were fond of playing this defence, and that they had got hold of some new idea or other associated with the later break-through P-Q4.
$3 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ has point if Black is aiming at avoiding the variation: 3 ..., P-KKt3; 4 P-K4, B-Kt2; 5 P-B3, O-O; 6 B-K3, P-K4; 7 KKt-K2 (see Game No. 21, supra). However, one must point out that since Pirc's innovation in 1939 (7 ..., KP $\times$ P!; $8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ and then $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ) this variation has become less convincing.
The continuation: $4 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; ${ }_{5} \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ leads to approximate equality. In one NajdorfBoleslavsky game (Groningen, 1946)

Black "had" to make more than one blunder after this Queen exchange, in order to lose the game.

| 4 | Kt-B3 | QKt-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | P-KKt3 | P-KKt3 |
| 6 B-Kt2 | B-Kt2 |  |
| 7 O-O | O-O |  |
| 8 P-K4 | R-K1 |  |

Black if allowed threatens to seize the initiative with $9 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ (or first $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ) followed by P-Q4. At the board I could not find a sound continuation and decided to liquidate this threat by resort to the most radical method (see Game No. 72, infra, note to White's 9th).

| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ |
| 11 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |  |

12 B-K3
Of course, if White played at once $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 3$, it would be met by $12 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and then Black's second Knight would be transferred via Q2-B4 to an excellent position. Perhaps, for this reason even now the better move would have been $12 \ldots$ KKt-Q2, but Boleslavsky did not want to close the QB1-KR6 diagonal.

[^6]$12 \ldots$
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$

White aims at once to exploit a convenient opportunity to propose a Knight exchange. However, the move 13 P-B4 invited itself, and after $13 \ldots$ P-B4; $14 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ White would have had the initiative.
13 ..
P-Kt3

14 Q-Q2
Now $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is no longer convincing because of $14 \ldots, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! with great complications.

| $14 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}!$ |

Perfectly sound. In an analogous position a Flohr-Lilienthal game played at Moscow in 1936 demonstrated that $15 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 16$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ ! is in White's favour.
$16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad$ very

Boleslavsky is playing very thoughtfully, if not too much so! Evidently he was afraid that $16 \ldots$, P-K5 would be followed by $17 \mathrm{Kt}-$ B2! with the possible threat of P-KKt4. However, in this continuation Black would retain his Knight on B4, while in all probability he could prevent the advance of the KKtP.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5 \\
18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 &
\end{array}
$$

All the commentators estimated the position here as in Black's favour; in my view this was due to a misapprehension.

On the Q side, where White can initiate a pawn advance with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4-\mathrm{Kt5}$, his superiority is obvious. Black's passed pawn at K5 brings Black no advantage whatever while so many minor pieces are left on the board, and his only comfort is the weakness of the White KKtP.

However, this weakness is only apparent, for Black's minor pieces cannot attack it.

Position after White's 18th move

18.

19 R-B2
Q-B3
$20 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$
B-Q2
$21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2 \quad \mathrm{Kt} 2 \mathrm{~B} 3$
22 B-Q4 QR-K1
23 Q-K3 $\quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$
$24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$
$25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$
26 B-K2 P-R4
All these manœuvres are easy to understand. White has disposed his Bishops to the best advantage and has blocked the K5 pawn; now he has only to place his Rooks so as to secure the K side. Black is preparing to double his Rooks on the KKt file.

| 27 | R-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 | R-KB1 |
| 29 | R(B1)-B2 |
| 30 | R-KKt1 |
| P-R3 | B-Kt2 |
|  | P-KR5 |

An unfortunate idea. Boleslavsky, evidently a little perturbed by White's slow manœuvres, was under the impression that he had the better game. He was afraid of being too late with this break-through; and "supposing White suddenly decided to close the position with P-KR4 . . .?" Of course, the sound continuation was $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KB} 1-\mathrm{K} 2$ followed by KR-Kt2 and Q-R3, though I think that even then White was left with
the greater possibilities. Now White is the first to gather the fruits of opening the game on the K side.

Position after Black's 30th move


The only defence. As soon as White's second Rook reached the KKt file a threat of capturing the Queen arose: $34 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 35 R-R5 ch.
$34 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$
B-R3

35 R(B)-Kt5
The simplest. In the last resort White retains superiority in material with a crushing position.
$35 \ldots$
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$
$36 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$

Hopeless, too, is $36 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, if only because of $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, QK8 ch; 38 K-Kt2, or $37 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, followed by $38 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$.

| $37 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $38 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

Of course, not $38 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$; 39 Q-R4 ch, with mate next move. $39 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$

Simpler is $39 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $40 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $41 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$.

| $39 \ldots$ | $R \times P!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 Q-R8 ch | $K-K t 3$ |
| 41 Q-Kt8 ch | $K-B 4$ |

move. His superiority is great, but the finish was not without interest. 42 Q-B8 ch K-B5

Position after Black's 42nd move


If $42 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $43 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$, K-R2; 44 R-Kt4!! (44 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ leads to technical difficulties because of the open position of White's King), $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ( $45 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ threatened. But if $44 \ldots$, $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$; then $45 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathbf{R}$ !, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; 46 K-K1, Q $\times$ R; 47 Q-B7 ch, K-R3; $48 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$, and White has an extra piece); $45 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}, \quad \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $46 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! the result of the game is decided at once.

## 43 Q-K6

An amusing move. Despite the exposed position of White's King, he succeeds in avoiding perpetual check, whereas it is impossible to save the Black King from attack.

| $43 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $44 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Q-B6 ch |
| $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ | Q-Kt6 ch |

45 K-Kt1 Q-Kt6 ch
Or $45 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $46 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2 \mathrm{ch}$, K-Kt4; 47 B-K3 ch.

| 46 K-B1 | Q-B6 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 47 B-B2 | Q-R4 |

No different result follows from 47 ..., R-B1; 48 Q-R6 ch, K-K4; 49 Q-Kt5 ch, Q-B4; 50 Q-K7 ch, K-B5; 51 Q-K3, mate.
$48 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2 \mathrm{ch} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ 49 P-R4 ch Resigns

No. 70. English Opening

| Botvinnik | Levenfish |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ |

This exchange, in conjunction with the later Knight manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, was played by Nenarokov as long ago as 1933, against me (Leningrad Masters' Tournament). By so playing Black succeeds in exchanging off the Bishop at R4.

| $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

Black has gained his end: the Bishop exchange is unavoidable.

| $11 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

Position after Black's 12th move


In this position, against Nenarokov I played $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, and after $13 \ldots$, Q-K2 continued 14 B-K2. Later Nenarokov allowed the pawn advance: $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and found himself in a difficult situation owing to the awkward position of his Knight at Kt3. During analysis of
my game with Nenarokov I came to the conclusion that it is simplest of all for White to play $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ at once, depriving Black's Knight of his square at K4.

## 13 P-KB4! <br> Q-K2

This move is pointless, as White was intending to transfer the King to KB2 in any case.

## 14 K-B2 <br> $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$

Of course, it is tempting to transfer the Knight to QB5, but this move to B1 gives White the possibility of striking an unexpected combinational blow. In 1933, when commentating my game with Nenarokov in the periodical Shakhmati $V$ S.S.S.R. (Chess in the U.S.S.R.) after the moves $13 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$; 14 B-K2, I wrote: "There is nothing in the inviting pawn sacrifice: $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3 . "$ In the present position K-B1 is impossible, as B1 is occupied by the Knight. So the pawn sacrifice is perfectly sound.

| $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} t 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Position after Black's 16th move


This leads to a completely lost position. True, Black's situation cannot be regarded as entirely satisfactory in any case. For instance:
(1) $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$.
(2) $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $17 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$,
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t} ; 18 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 19$ $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} ; 20 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$; $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 23 Q-B5 ch, K-K2; 24 Q-K5 ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 1 ; 25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$, and White has every reason to count on the win, as the Black Rooks are separated.
(3) $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$, Q-B3; 18 Q-K4 ch, Kt-K3 (18 ..., K-Q1; $19 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $20 \mathrm{R}-$ Q6); $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$; $20 \mathrm{KR}-$ Q1 ch, K-B1; 21 QR-Kt1, QR-Kt1; 22 Q-R4, KR-Q1 (22 ..., R-QR1; 23 Q-Q7ch, K-Ktl; $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ch) ; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} ; 24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, Q $\times \mathrm{Kt}$; 25 Q-K8.

| $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | Q-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 QR-Q1 | P-KKt3 |

The only possibility. Black gets a momentary breathing-space. Entirely bad is $18 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$; $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B} ; 21 \mathrm{Q} \times$ $\mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 ; 22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch.

## $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ <br> R-B1

Defending the KBP and removing

## No. 71. French Defence

| $\quad$V. Panov <br> (White) | M. Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| ---: | :---: |
| 1 | P-K4 |
| 2 | P-Q3 |

This move has a simple explanation: To begin with, White wants to avoid the prepared variations, and, secondly, he wants to transpose the game to the King's Indian Defence (with colours reversed) of which he is a great devotee.

Generally speaking, in such continuations White does not attempt to exploit the advantage of first move and concentrates on the middlegame. This is Master V. Panov's aim: he is one of those players who readily go in for any complications (even disadvantageous ones) in the
the Rook to a safer position. If $19 \ldots$, Q-K3 White wins at once with $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}(20 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; 21 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ).

## 20 P-Kt4

Black's position is lost, as White will be able to fix the weakness of his KB3 square.

| 20 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 22 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

25 R-R
Probably $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ is stronger.

## $25 \ldots \quad B-B 4$

The KKtP should not have been defended.

## 26 P-K4 <br> B-K3

$26 \ldots$, B-Q2 would be better, but it would only drag out a game which has gone so unsatisfactorily for Black.
27 P-B5
Resigns
confidence that in such positions he is bound to outplay his opponent!

| 2 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |  |
| $4 \mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |  |

5 QKt-Q2
P-Q4
5 B-K2
This play in the style of Philidor's Defence is rejected by modern masters. It is now well known that the fianchetto development of the KB is fundamental to the King's Indian Defence.

| 5 | $\ldots$ | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ |  |

Evidently White has come to the conclusion that the game is developing too "normally," without difficulties for either side. So to begin with he decides to create difficulties for himself. This is the
only possible explanation of the extravagant manœuvre which he is contemplating. He should have continued $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.
$\begin{array}{ll}7 \dddot{\mathrm{Kt}} \mathrm{K} 3 & \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \\ { }^{2} & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4\end{array}$
Position after Black's 8th move


It transpires that the manœuvre Kt-KB1-K3 only helps Black to advance P-B4-B5 and to take the initiative; however, this does not disturb White; he has deliberately gone in for this continuation.
If during the game Panov had guessed that his strivings to depart from the thoroughly studied variations were all for nothing, and that Black was simply following Capablanca in his game with Nimzovitch Nimzovitch-Capablanca, San-Sebastian, 1911) he would have been in despair! We note only that Nimzcriich did not embark on the mamavre Kt-KB1-K3!

## $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ <br> 10 P-KKt3!

White has decided that the complications are now entered upon and he must play with all his might. He has in mind $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, followed by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \times \mathrm{B}$ in order to weaken the black squares on Black's side. So Black is bound to advance the KBP farther, and the "battle" of the middle-game is joined.

Nothing good comes of $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, P-B5; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; 12 \mathrm{Kt}-$ B2, P-QKt4; 13 P-QR4, Kt-R4.

| 10 | $\ldots$ | P-KB5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Kt-Kt2 | Kt-Kt3 |
| 12 | Q-Kt3 |  |

A cunning psychological sally. Of course, White had no doubt that Black would sacrifice the KtP, and the extra pawn would give him some compensation for the Black attack. One could have replied $12 \ldots$, B-B2, but Black prefers to accept White's challenge and pass immediately to active operations.
12 ...
B-K3
$13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
The immediate $13 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{Kt}-$ R4; 14 Q-R6, B-B1; 15 Q-Kt5, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 16 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is altogether bad! With exchanges at B4 White recovers to some extent from his backward development and effects a weakening of the Black QBP.

| $13 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ |  |

$16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
White has no choice, he must take the pawn, for otherwise Black continues $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$, or $16 \ldots$, B-Kt5, or even $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$, retaining the initiative with equality in material. Now Black must play very exactly, as after any simplification White's extra pawn is a weighty factor.

| $16 \ldots$ | Kt-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 Q-R6 | B-B1! |
| 18 Q-Kt5 | B-Kt5 |

## $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$

Forced. Of course, such "manœuvres" do not make for activity among White's pieces; his Queen remains in a dangerous position.

## 19 ... <br> Q-B2

Now Panov discovers an ingenious
way of complicating Black's task, and avoids the threats to his Queen arising from both $20 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; 21 Q-R6, B-B1 and $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ ! winning the queen in either case.
$20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ ! $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$
Of course, not $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, and $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch.
$21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ Kt-Q3!
A fitting reply! Bad for Black is $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! Now 22 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is impossible because of 22 $\ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch and $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch. As White must defend the KBP he can retire his Queen only to QKt2.
22 Q-Kt2
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$
$23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
Both now and later $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ leads to a permanent weakness on QB4.
23
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}$
$24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
R-K1!
Position after Black's 24th move


A not very striking, yet probably decisive move. Now White is bound to determine his King's position and to Castle long. In this case the open QKt file guarantees Black speedy success!

$$
25 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4
$$

So far Black had played irreproachably, but when he had only to inflict the final blow he did not discover the simplest method. If my
memory does not betray me, I rejected $25 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ ! to be followed by $26 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$, because of $26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ( $26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ ), $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, overlooking the fact that White could not play 26 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ because of $26 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. (Unfortunately, in the Twelfth U.S.S.R. Championship my play was marred by a number of such oversights). So I decided to mobilize the QRP also, in order to prevent the Knight transfer to White's QKt3, and also if occasion offered to seize his QKt 2 square.

I must further point out that any delay in attacking (e.g. $25 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KBP} ; 26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ) fundamentally eases White's situation.

## 26 K-Kt1

Avoiding the variation $26 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $27 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ch; $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$; 30 K-Q2, R-Kt7; simultaneously White prepares $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$.

$$
26 \ldots \quad \text { P-R5 }
$$

An unpleasant pawn for White: $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ is met by $27 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$; $28 \ldots, \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch. 27 Kt-Q4 R-K2!

Delayed by two moves, this Rook manœuvre none the less is decisive, as now also, because of the variation $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ( $29 \mathrm{Kt}-$ $\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$ ! winning a piece), $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ! the White King cannot find safety in the corner of the board.

However, Panov devises an extraordinary combination which all but saves the game.
28 P-B3
A necessary preliminary move, as White needs the KKt file.
28 ..
R-R5
29 KR-K1

Brilliant, though, alas, mistaken. As in any case there was no defence,

White has had to decide on the Queen sacrifice.
29 ...
R-Kt2
30 R-K8 ch!
K-B2

Black has no choice, as $30 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ is met by $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$.

## 31 R-B8 ch!

Now Black must play very carefully: $31 \ldots, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ is followed by $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6 \mathrm{ch}$, while after $31 \ldots$, K-Kt3; 32 R-Kt1 ch, K-R4; 33 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}!$ !, $\quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q} ; \quad 34 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \quad \mathrm{ch}$, K-R3; 35 R-B6 ch!!, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ (or $35 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ ); $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, K-R4; $37 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, White forces a draw with perpetual check. A good idea!

## 31 ... K-K2!

The only move; $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, is now without danger for Black; 32
$\ldots, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t} ; 33 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch, $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$.
White also has one move left.

## 32 R-K1 ch R-K5!!

Fine, though rather cruel. Of course, if $32 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ ! White wins.

White's pieces are disunited, and he is in a helpless situation. The only explanation of his further
resistance is that he was slow in recovering from this unexpected overthrow of all his combination.

Position after Black's 32nd move


| $33 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| :---: | :---: |
| $34 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Q-Kt3 ch |
| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $36 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-Kt4 |
| 37 R-B1 ch | K-K1 |
| $38 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | Kt-R6 ch |
| $39 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | Q-Kt8 ch |
| $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Q-Kt7 ch |
| 41 K-K3 | Q $\times$ BP |

White resigns. In this game Panov clearly aimed at complicating the struggle, but, sowing the wind, he reaped the whirlwind!

## NINETEEN FORTY-ONE

DURING the first two months of 1941 I trained intensively for the matchtournament for the title of Absolute Champion of the U.S.S.R. ${ }^{1}$ It has to be said that after my lack of success in the U.S.S.R. Championship held the previous year certain "experts" were quite prepared to relegate me to the "has-beens," maybe they even succeeded in convincing me that it was so! But the attraction of becoming absolute champion (i.e. a match champion) was so great that I decided none the less to "try my luck."

In my training I was given invaluable assistance by Ragozin, with whom I have been in joint training since at least 1936. This time, in addition to training games and joint analysis, we also practised to accustom me to specific tournament conditions. For instance, in the Twelfth Championship
${ }^{1}$ See Championship Chess, by M. Botvinnik (London and U.S.A., 1950).
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Tournament I had suffered through not being used to tobacco smoke, so we had to resort to "radical" treatment: during our training games Ragozin "smoked" me for five hours in succession. Naturally, I soon got used to tobacco.

In the match-tournament the struggle was extremely tense. But this tıme I was in good form, and the defeat which I managed to inflict on Keres in the third round (Game No. 73, infra) played a great part in the results. My victory in the match-tournament ranks as one of the best achievements in all my chess career.

When the Great Patriotic War began the need for defence of the Motherland called for the application of my powers in a different field.

## MATCH-TOURNAMENT FOR THE TITLE OF ABSOLUTE CHAMPION OF THE U.S.S.R. <br> March-April

No. 72. King's Indian Defence

| M. Botvinnik (White) | A. Lilienthal (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | Kt-KB3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-KKt3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | B-Kt2 |
| 4 Kt -B3 | P-Q3 |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | QKt-Q2 |
| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 7 O-O | P-K4 |
| 8 P-K4 | R-K1 |
| 9 B-K3 |  |

This move presents Black with a difficult problem. It will be fully appreciated only by those devoted to the King's Indian Defence. The point is that of recent years a system of play was found for Black ( $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4)$. With $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ this is hardly practicable.

So Black has to think of something different.

$$
9 \ldots \quad P \times P
$$

It is doubtful whether the continuation $9 \ldots$ Kt-Kt5; 10 B-Kt5, P-KB3; 11 B-B1 improves Black's position at all.
$10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$
Kt-K4
$11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

$$
\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{~B})-\mathrm{Kt} 5
$$

Temporarily Black has the initiative. But the position of his pieces
in the centre is insecure, while White's central pawn at K4 cramps Black's play.

| 12 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | $\mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

Black gets rid of the K-pawn, but White's pawn superiority developing on the K side gives him good chances.

| $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Position after Black's 15th move


16 Q-Q2
Inconsistent. After the simple $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ White's superiority would have been unquestionable. In the event of $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 17$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad$ White would, of course, have had to go over temporarily to the defence, but gradually
his material advantage would have told.
16 ... P-KR4
Of course!
$\begin{array}{ll}17 \text { QR-K1 } & \text { Q-Q2 } \\ 18 \text { K-R2 } & \text { K-R2 }\end{array}$
18 K-R2
Not $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ because of 19 Q-Q5 ch.
19 B-Kt5 Kt-K4
Black's situation is not easy and he seeks counter-play.
$19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, is not good. 20 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 22 P-KKt4, B-K3; 23 Kt-B4. However, even after $19 \ldots$. . Kt-K4; $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ Black would be in a difficult situation; in the variation $20 \ldots$, B-Q6; 21 R-KKt1, Kt(B)Kt5 ch; 22 K-R1! (but not 22 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ) his minor pieces are insecurely placed.

But after White's weaker reply the direct threat to Black is eliminated.

| 20 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |
| After $22 \ldots$, | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 23 \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, |  |

No. 73. Nimzo-Indian Defence

| P. Keres | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |

(White)
(Black)

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

This move is not in harmony with the main idea of this defence: struggle for the centre with pieces. But, since White has made the unenterprising 4 Q-B2 and temporarily left the QP without defence, $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, initiating energetic play in the centre, is entirely justified.
$5 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

K-Kt2 White would have somewhat the better position because of the weakness of the Black KKtP.
23 Q-B3
Q-B2
$24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$

White transfers the Knight to Q4 in order to force the exchange of Black's Bishop.
Now Black could make his defence easier by $24 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, B-B3; 26 Q-B2, Q-B2.
$24 \ldots \quad$ QR-Q1
Offers White new chances.
$25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$
$26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$
The correct move is $26 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$; after $27 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $28 \mathrm{Kt}-$ $\mathrm{Kt5} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, followed by Kt-K4 Black's position is defensible.

Black's last slip leads immediately to the showdown!
$27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$
Black resigns, for after 27 ..., $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 29 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, White wins a pawn and launches a very strong attack.

6 B-Kt5

## P-KR3

7 B-R4
Of course White tries to keep the Knight pinned, but after this move he cannot avoid a sharp struggle.
7 ... P-B4
Perfectly logical. Black exploits the temporary weakness of White's Q4 in order to seize the initiative.

I thought of this move during a game with Kotov (Moscow, 1940) and I employed it then, mainly to avoid the awkward variations associated with $7 \ldots$, B-K3. Several rounds later in the same tournament I employed $7 \ldots$ P-B4 against Mikenas. He replied $8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$,
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came out of the opening with the better game, and, after mistakes on both sides, gained the victory.

Keres, evidently, was impressed by my game with Mikenas and without much hesitation castled QR . It is worth adding that Ragozin reminded me that he and I had analyzed the move $7 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ as long ago as 1936, and I had then convincingly refuted it! To my regret, I forgot the refutation.

More recently I discovered that I employed the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ move as long ago as 1931 (Lebediev-Botvinnik game, semi-final of Soviet Championship, Moscow, 1931), but without the preceding P-KR3.
8 O-O-O
Position after White's 8th move


This apparently strong move leads to defeat. In reality, with an undeveloped $K$ side, to expose the King to the possibility of a direct attack by Black's pieces from the front (the $B$ file) as well as from the flank (the diagonal QKt1-KR7) is, to say the least, risky!

Against Mikenas I continued 8 $\ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ without any worthwhile result.

In November-December, 1940, I discovered the best course for Black. Great was my chagrin when in one of the January issues of " 64 " (1941) I saw the Belavenietz-Simagin game,
in which Simagin made the first two moves of the correct plan! Keres did not notice this game, or he would of course have seen the light! So I was able to employ the prepared variation after all.

$$
8 \ldots \quad B \times K t
$$

The QKt is enemy No. 1. It has to be destroyed in order to secure the centre, and also to open up the QB file.

## $9 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$

$9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 10 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ also retained the initiative for Black, but this is the very continuation White should have chosen.
$9 \ldots \quad$ P-KKt4
While the White Knight had to be eliminated, I had to preserve my own Knight to protect the centre. The weakening of the pawn formation is of no great significance. Events develop with such speed that time is of prime importance. White's immobilized pieces on the K side have no time to come to their King's aid.

## 10 B-Kt3 <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

This move suggests itself. The QB file must be opened up. In the above-mentioned game with Belavenietz, Simagin continued $10 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, which is contrary to the correct plan of attack.
$11 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$
Kt-B3
12 Q-QR4

In the given situation this is, probably, even better than withdrawing the Queen. White, by pinning the Knight, artificially closes the B file and tries to compel Black to lose a tempo in freeing the Knight.
12 ...
B-B4
And so White's QKt1-R7 diagonal is occupied. Now Black merely has to occupy the B file. Which is more
dangerous, which should be parried first?
13 P-K3
R-QB1
14 B-Q3

Position after White's 14th move


Keres tries to secure the King's retreat and closes the diagonal, an imperceptible mistake leading immediately to disaster.
A better plan would have been to bring up the Knight to close the $B$ file. In all fairness it must be said that even after 14 Kt K2, P-R3; $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; 16

No. 74. French Defence

| V. Smyslov (White) | M. Bot <br> (Bla |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ | B-Kt5 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | P--QB4 |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | Kt-K2 |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | QKt-B3 |
| $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |
| $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ is recognized subtle. |  |
| 8 | Q-R4 |
| 9 Q-Q2 | P-B5 |
| $10 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Q-R5 |

This is as in the PogrebysskyBotvinnik game (Leningrad, 1939:
$\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5} ; 17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ Black would have the advantage.

$$
14 \ldots \quad \text { Q-Q2 }
$$

With the serious threat of a discovered check. White has no choice.

| $15 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

This pin can be -broken only at the cost of material.

| $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

$18 \ldots$, Kt-B4 would be followed by a check saving the Rook (19 R-K3 ch).
19 R-Q1
P-Kt4
The thrust that crowns the attack. The Black Knight secures Q5, which leads immediately to mate.

| $20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| Resigns. |  |

White's K-side pieces took no part in the game.

No. 63, supra). Smyslov went in for this variation to try out a new idea-an immediate pawn attack on the K side. However, even in this case Black probably has equal chances.

| 11 | P-R4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 | P-R5 5 |
| 13 | Kt-R4 |

The correct approach is first $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ and then $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$. With the exchange of Knights White's chances of success decrease.

## 13 ... <br> Kt-B4 <br> $14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

This is entirely inconsistent, since the Black Bishop now comes into play. White hopes to open up the position with P-Kt4 (after the Black
pawn reaches B 4 ), but it does not lead to his advantage. It was still not too late to play $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ followed by $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$.

| 14 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | KR-Kt1 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 16 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |  |

Position after White's 16th move


A cursory glance at the board is sufficient to reveal the weak features of White's position: his Bishops are inactive, and Black will get a good base at KB4 for his pieces. Also, one should not lose sight of the organic defect of White's pawn formationhis $\mathbf{Q}$ side can keep in touch with the K side only via QB 1 .

If Black continued $16 \ldots$, PKKt4, then after $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ e.p., $\mathrm{P}(2) \times \mathrm{P} ; 18 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$, he would have an excellent position.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
16 \ldots & \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} \\
17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}
\end{array}
$$

In one move Black loses all his advantage! Even now $17 \ldots$. . B-B4 with the better game, was not too late.

The White Rook should not have been allowed to reach the fourth rank. Because of this "triffe" the entire picture changes.

| $18 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Q-Q2 |
| 20 R-B4 | Q-K3 |

Alas! Black cannot force the
exchange of White's KRP by $20 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P}-$ KKt4; $21 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ e.p., $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$, which would lead to a won position for Black (the passed pawn on the R file and the strong Knight at B4), because of $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 6$, and White wins a piece.

Since Black does not succeed in exchanging his BP for the RP, the position of the Knight at B4 proves to be not so impregnable as might appear, for the Knight cannot be defended by the Rook.
21 Q-B3
P-KKt3
22 P-R4
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$

23 B-R3
Position after White's 23rd move


Now Black cannot initiate any aggressive action, as he continually has to reckon with the threat $K-Q 2$, $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K K t 1}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$, and $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. Black always has to be ready to lose the exchange and so he cannot even think of aggressive play. On the other hand, if he puts up a sound defence the loss of exchange leads to double-edged play-it is not always favourable for White.

Here Black offered a draw, which White declined.

| 23 | $\ldots$ | P-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | K-Q2 | KR-Kt1 |
| 25 | R-QKt1 | K-Kt2 |
| 26 | P-R5 | R-QB1 |
| 27 | QRP $\times P$ | RP $\times P$ |
| 28 | Q-Kt4 |  |

White does not notice the aboveindicated Rook sacrifice at KKt6 and undertakes an unnecessary and cumbersome shift of the Queen's Rook to B3 (in order to threaten the same sacrifice of the exchange!).


Of course, the Rook sacrifice involves some risk: after $32 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 33 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} ; 34 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $35 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$, the endgame is very complicated. So White evidently makes a routine decision: to draw the game out to the 40th move and the adjournment in order to analyse the endgame at leisure.

| 32 | $\ldots$ | R-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | Q-R1 | R-QR1 |
| 34 | Q-QB1 |  |

Useless. The Queen is needed on the $K$ side.
34 ...
$\mathbf{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Kt} \mathbf{1}$

35 Q-Kt2
White feels so confident that unwittingly he makes a losing move.
Now Black exploits the unhappy position of the White Queen and with the tempi thus gained transfers his Rooks to the 8th rank to carry

No. 75. French Defence
I. Bondarevsky (White)
M. Botvinnik (Black)

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |  |

3 P-K5
Probably the oldest variation of the French Defence. It was dropped
out a mating attack. Meanwhile White's Rooks play a sorry role.

Position after White's 35th move

$35 \ldots$
R-R5
Firmly tying down the Queen to the Bishop (if the Bishop remains where it is).

## 36 B-Q6 ch

The continuation $36 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-$ QR1; 37 B-Kt2, R-R7 would not help White, if only because of the possible manœuvre: Q-Q2-Kt4.

| $36 \ldots$ | K-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37 Q-Kt1 | R(Kt)-QR1 |
| 38 Q-KR1 | R-R8 |
| 39 Q-R3 | R-KKt8 |

There is no satisfactory defence against the threat $R(R)-R 8, R(K t)-$ K8 and $R(R)-Q 8$ mate.

| 40 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 41 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 42 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
|  | Resigns. |

because it was obvious that White has difficulty in retaining the pawn centre. In the second and third decade of this century Nimzovitch revived the variation. He did not hold the centre with pawns, but defended it with pieces, readily exchanging off the central $Q$ and $K$ pawns.

After one of the games in the

Levenfish-Botvinnik match (1937) in which Black succeeded in evolving a satisfactory defence system, the move $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ has rarely been met with in tournaments. Bondarevsky did not know that 1937 game, and so this present game is not of much value from the aspect of opening theory.
3 ...
P-QB4
$4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$
Nimzovitch's system. White avoids P-QB3.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
4 \\
5 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 & \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3
\end{array}
$$

The continuation $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ would assist Black's development. So White sacrifices the pawn, hoping to recover it later and simultaneously capture the central Q4 with his pieces.

| $5 \ldots$ | $P \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $60-O$ | $B-B 4$ |

This makes it difficult for White to recover the pawn and easier for Black to mobilize his forces.

## 7 P-QR3

This move would be to the point if White continued with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$. But he rejects this move, in order not to weaken his Q side.

## 7 ... <br> KKt-K2 <br> 8 QKt-Q2

Preferable is $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and if $8 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, then $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$.

| 8 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| 10 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

$11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
White has missed the moment for the move B-KB4 and now begins to run into difficulties. For instance, he cannot play: $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{B}$; $12 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt}) \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, Q-R5. So he prepares for this variation by playing the text move.

In addition he threatens the attack P-KR4-R5. However, he has left his Knight at B3 without defence, which of course inspires Black with the idea of opening up the KB file.

Position after White's 11th move

$11 \ldots$
P-B3
White cannot exchange at B 6 . E.g. after $12 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$, Black's pressure along the KB file is unavoidable. So to defend the centre White is forced to exchange his King's Bishop.
$12 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$
13 Q-Q3

Some critics criticized Bondarevsky for not regaining the pawn with $13 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt}) \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$. But, in this variation also Black's superiority is obvious after $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, K-B2. However, Black could play still more energetically: $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 14 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 15 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$; $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2$, and White can hardly save himself.

```
\(13 \ldots\)
K-B2
14 P-KR4
```

Preparing B-B4. White, of course, cannot give up the centre, for if $14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt}) \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ the
pawn centre and Black's two Bishops would settle the matter quickly.
14 ...
Q-KKt1!

## Position after Black's 14th move



I think this is probably the decisive move of the game. Setting up threats to White's K side, Black forces the exchange of Queens, after which he inevitably captures the centre.
$15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
$15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is no good because of $15 \ldots$, Q-R2; $16 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt}) \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt} ; 17 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ !
$15 \ldots$
Q-R2

## 16 B-Kt4

Hoping by way of B-B5 to exchange off one of Black's Bishops. But Black gives back the pawn and captures square K4.

| No. 76. French Defence |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| M. Botvinnik (White) | I. Boleslavsky (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-K3 |
| 2 P -Q4 | P--Q4 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt-Q2}$ | P-QB4 |
| $4 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5} \mathrm{ch}$ | Kt-B3 |
| $6 \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | B-Q3 |
| $7 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | Kt-K2 |
| $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | B $\times$ P |
| $9 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | B-Kt3 |


| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $18 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathbf{P}$ |  |

$18 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$
It is no better to move $18 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP} ; 19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$ ch, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$.
18
19
20
21
22
23
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B P}$
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$
$-\mathrm{K}$
$\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}$
R-K1
R-KKt1
22 Kt -R4
Of course, it is difficult for White to struggle against Black's pawn predominance in the centre and the excellent disposition of his pieces, but now comes a rapid denouement. 23 K-B1 would have put up a stronger resistance.

| 23 | $\ldots$ | B-KB4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | R-K2 | P-Q6 |

$25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
Or $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{QP} ; 26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, B-B5; $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$.

| 25 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{K} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Ch}$ |
| $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |  |

29 R-KB1
K-K2

There is no other defence against $29 \ldots, \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch, or $29 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
$29 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 8=\mathbf{Q}$
Resigns.

## 10 B-K3 <br> $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ <br> $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Ktch}$

This move (in my first game with Boleslavsky in this tournament I played $11 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ ) led commentators to draw the most profound deductions.

They explained it as meaning that Botvinnik did not wish to repeat the same variation a second time, and that he was afraid of some improvement that Boleslavsky had prepared.

All this was, of course, sheer
imagination. The fact is that after $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ I got no tangible advantage whatever, and so Boleslavsky was not averse from my repeating the variation. But my move $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ in the previous game has to be explained as due to a miscalculation. I had also considered $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch, but in the variation $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}(11 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ weakens Black's B4 square and can be accepted even without analysis as favourable for White); $12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, B-K3, I overlooked that White wins a pawn by $13 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{B} 3) \times \mathrm{P}$.
This time, of course, I corrected my mistake and played $11 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$. So I was not avoiding any nonexistent resource prepared by Boleslavsky; on the contrary, Boleslavsky himself, who had not analysed our previous game carefully, fell victim to the strengthened system I had prepared.

| 11 | P | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |
| $13 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ |  |
| 14 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |

Temporarily preventing the occupation of B5. White, in his turn, immediately insures the possibility of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

$$
15 \text { QR-Kt1 } \quad \text { R-K1 }
$$

Position after Black's 15th move


16 KR-K1

This move in the Nimzovitch style -"overprotection" of the K pawn -throws away a good 50 per cent of White's advantage. The simple 16 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $17 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ is the logical continuation.
16 ...
$\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
The correct plan. In conjunction with B-Kt5 Black gains the central K4 for his Knight.
$17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$
B-Kt5
$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$

It was hardly possible to play $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ because of $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$.

$18 \ldots$| 19 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |

20 P-K4
Perhaps most consistent would have been $20 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. Then the struggle would have been simplified, but White would also have firmly established himself on the black squares.
White chooses another plan, leading to lively combinational play, but less in accordance with the nature of the position. By exchanging the K pawn White opens up the K file for pressure on the adverse Knight. But, on the other hand, Black gets the Q file for counter-play.
So Black should at once have played: $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$, reinforcing the Knight. The exchange at K4 aids the development of White's initiative.

| $20 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ |

This move is very risky, of course, as it allows the sortie $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$, with attacks on two pieces. In this case it is useless to play: $22 \ldots$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t} ; \quad 23 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 24 \quad \mathrm{Q}-$ QB 3 ! or $22 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{K}$.

Even in the variation $22 \ldots$, P-B3; $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} ; 24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $25 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 6$, Black's position is not too good. Yet in this very

Position after Black's 21st move

variation Black could have saved himself after $24 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4!$; 25 Q-B4 (25 Q $\times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ), $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $26 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 4)-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ with approximately equal play. So Kotov's comment, in the special issue No. 9 of " 64 ," to the 22 nd move of this game, in which he states that 22 QKKt3 leads to a win for White, is without much justification.

| 22 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $24 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $\mathrm{~F}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |  |

A mistake that loses the game. White obtains time to withdraw his King, which frees the Knights from the pin.

Black had his last chance to consolidate the position with $24 \ldots$, B-R4 (taking advantage of the fact that the move $25 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{K} 6$ is impossible) followed by $25 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$. The Bishop at B2 would have covered K3 and protected the Rook on K1. The last-mentioned circumstance is important because of the possible opening of the K file.

## 25 K-R1 <br> B-Q2

Leads to the loss of a pawn, but Black is already in great difficulties. For instance, $25 \ldots$, B-R4 is bad because of $26 \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Q} 4)-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$; $27 \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} ; 28 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$, and 29 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$.

It is difficult for Black to defend
himself against $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ followed by $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$.
$26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$

$$
\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}
$$

27 Q $\times$ P
Q-Q1

Black's game is lost, but the struggle is still not without interest.

| $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $29 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |

Or $29 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $31 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $32 \mathrm{P}-$ B4, P-B4; 33 R-B4.
Now comes a combination which leads to a won Rook and pawn endgame.

| $30 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 32 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{K} 8$ |
| 33 | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ ch |
| 34 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q K t 1} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5} \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K}+5$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{B} 2$ |  |

$35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
White ties up the adverse King and Rook with the passed pawn and then strengthens the position of his own King.
$35 \ldots$
K-K3
36 P-Kt6
R-B1

## 37 P-R3

Also possible is $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}-\mathrm{B} 2-\mathrm{Kt3}$. It would be wrong to play $37 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7}$, R-QKt1; 38 K-Kt1, K-Q3; 39 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; $41 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~K}-$ B3; $43 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ with a probable draw.

| 37 | R-QKt1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 K-R2 | K-Q4 |
| 39 K-Kt3 | K-B3 |
| 40 | K-Kt4 |

Perhaps $40 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ is slightly better. The rest of the game is simple exploitation of advantage.

| 41 | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 42 R-K6 | R-Kt1 |
| 43 K-Kt5 | K-R3 |
| 44 P-R4 | K-Kt2 |
| 45 | P-R 5 |
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| 46 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 47 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 48 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 49 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |

Now R6 is won for the King and the Black pawn is doomed.

| $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ Speeds up the loss of the pawn |  |
| $51 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $52 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $53 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $54 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |


| No. 77. Ruy Lopez |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| V. Smyslov (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| 1 P-K4 | P-K4 |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-QB3 |
| 3 B-Kt5 | P-QR3 |
| 4 B-R4 | Kt-B3 |
| $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

An old continuation. White does not attempt to keep the initiative in the opening but relies on a favourable middle-game.

| $5 \ldots$ | P-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 P-B3 | B-K2 |
| 7 O-O | O-O |
| 8 R-K1 | P-QKt4 |
| 9 B-B2 |  |

White wants to prevent the manœuvre Kt-QR4 followed by P-B4, but Black delivers a blow in the centre, (P-Q4) and gets an equal game.

After 9 B-Kt3 we get the Ruy Lopez Variation which was the favourite weapon of A. Ilyin-Zhenevsky.

| $9 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P}-Q 4$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $10 \mathrm{QKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Black secures his central pawn at K4.
$11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$
12 P-KR3
Threatening $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$.

The "struggle" could have been abandoned now.

| 55 K-R6 | K-Q3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 56 P-Kt6 | R-K8 |
| 57 R-KB7 | K-K3 |
| $58 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | R-QR8 |
| $59 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7}$ | R-R8 ch |
| 60 K-Kt6 | R-Kt8 ch |
| 61 K-R7 | R-R8 ch |
| $62 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt8}$ | K-K2 |
| $63 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-Q2 |
| 64 R-K4 | R-R7 |
| 65 K-B7 | Resigns |
| 12 | P-R3 |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |  |

After 13 Kt-R4, P-Kt3, Black would have a quite reliable position. The protracted manœuvres undertaken by White are harmless for Black.

## 13 ... <br> Kt-KR2

The manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KR} 2$ and $\mathrm{B}-$ Kt4 aims at the exchange of black Bishops: in the event of exchange White's chances of an attack against the K side would be reduced to the minimum.
$14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
B-Kt4
15 Q-K2

White avoids exchanging Queens, but the obvious move is $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, exploiting Black's weakened QB4.

## 15 ...

Q-Q3
$16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$
Avoiding exchange of the black Bishops White persists in his resolution to make a direct attack on the Black King.
16 ...
KR-Q
$17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Of course, this active Knight should be destroyed, especially as it is disadvantageous for White to play $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ because of B-B5.
$18 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B} \quad$ Q-K2

Parrying 19 Kt -R4.

## $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$

As a result of the manœuvres the game has even gone in Black's favour; on the $K$ side all is quiet, while Black can start operations along the Q file.

But with this last move, Black loses two tempi, and the initiative. He should have played $19 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ at once.
20 Q-B3
R-Q2
$21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$
Position after White's 21st move


Black cannot prevent the White Knight reaching B5. In order to secure the Queen's transfer to KB3 Black must return his Knight to KR2.

| $21 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KR} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | QR-Q1 |
| $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | Q-B3 |
| $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ |  |

Having posted his Knight at B5, it is difficult to avoid supporting it by P-KKt4. Perhaps $24 \quad \mathbf{Q}+\mathbf{K} t 3$ with the threat $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ would have been more subtle. In this case Black would have defended himself with $24 \ldots$, Q-Kt3.

| $24 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |

The pressure along the $Q$ file is now real, for Black threatens to capture the centre of resistance, Q6.

White's next move prepares the development of the Bishop to K3.
26 P-B3
B-Q6
27 B-Kt3
P-B4

Black drives the Bishop back to Q1 and separates the White Rooks. But the struggle is of such a closed nature that this has no decisive significance.
It is no advantage for White to continue $28 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $29 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 5$, in view of $29 \ldots \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 5$.
$\begin{array}{ll}28 & \text { B-K3 } \\ 29 & \text { B-Q1 }\end{array}$
30 P-KR4
$30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ immediately is preferable.
$\begin{array}{ll}30 \ldots & \text { Kt-K3 } \\ 31 \text { P-R4 } & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}\end{array}$
Position after Black's 31st move


Only thus can Black avoid the opening up of the QR file. The struggle is so complicated that for some time White's extra pawn will not be of much significance.
$32 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$
White does not want to part with the two Bishops, so he does not play $33 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $34 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ (34 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP})$. As, on the other hand, there threatens $33 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{Kt} ; 34 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} ; 35 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 36 \mathrm{QR} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} ; 37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, he withdraws the King.
33 K-R1
P-Kt4

## 34 P-Kt5

P-QR4 35 B-B5
A mistake which could easily become fatal. White's situation is difficult, but in no circumstances should he have withdrawn his Bishop from an important defensive post. Any other move (for instance $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ ) would have been better.

| $35 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $36 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $37 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |  |

Position after White's 37th move


Of course he could not play 37 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ because of the attack along the KR file, but the text move is very weak. In any case White cannot close up the position by P-R5. Evidently in the variation 37 $\ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 38 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt1}$; $39 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, he overlooked the move Q-QKt3, after which the White Queen is lost.
The continuation recommended by Abramov (in the special issue No. 8 of " 64 "): 37 Q-R2 is better, but seemingly it also does not save the game in view of the brilliant stroke $37 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ! For instance, after $38 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP} ; 39 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 41 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $42 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $43 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$, R-Q6; $44 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$ White's situation is grave.
37 ...
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

38 R-KKt1 P-R4
Still simpler is $38 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 8$ with the threat B-R6. E.g. after 39 B $\mathrm{KB} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch} ; 40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ or $40 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ the outcome of the game is obvious.
39 Q-Kt5
$Q \times \mathbf{Q}$
$40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$

Now, too, $40 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 8$ leads at the very least to winning the exchange. It would seem that in any case Black has a won position, but Smyslov finds a remarkable way of saving himself.

## 41 R-KKt1 <br> Kt-R6

Sealed move. Black captures the KKt file for an attack on the White King.
42 R-K1
R-KKt1
43 R-R2!

The only move. Black planned $43 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$, then $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q})-\mathrm{KKt2}$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ch followed by R-R6 mate. No use 43 P-Kt3, P-B6; 44 R-R2 because of $44 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ and Black wins a piece. By interchanging moves White avoids this variation and secures the transfer of the Rook to KR2 to defend the King.

So Black discards the plan he had in mind.

| $43 \ldots$ | B-Kt8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44 R-R1 | B-Q6 |
| 45 R-R2 | Kt-B5 |
| 46 P-Kt4 |  |

Black threatened R-Kt7. White also tries to take advantage of his pawn superiority on the Q side, but Black has sufficient resources for defence.
46
47 P-Kt6
R-QB1
R-QKt2

White is now forced to give up the pawn at Kt4, which leads to further keen play-two far advanced passed pawns on each side!
48 B-K3
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

This mistake turns out to be decisive. It was still not too late for 50 R-QKt2, R-QR1 (50 ..., P-B6; $51 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$; $52 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$; 53 R-R3); 51 B-Q2, R-R3; 52 B-Kt4 and Black cannot break through anywhere.

White relies on his pawns, but Black's pawns prove to be more dangerous.

| $50 \ldots$ | P-Kt7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 51 B-R4 | P-B6 |

Preventing P-R6.

| 52 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 53 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{QKt5}$ |
| 54 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{K} 7$ |
| $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B} 5$ |  |

The decisive manœuvre-Black obtains three linked passed pawns.
$55 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$
56 P-R6
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ !

The pawn is worth the Rook. Now the Black pawns cannot be stopped!

## $57 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ <br> P-Q6

Smyslov pondered over his next move for fifty minutes-but there is

| No. 78. Slav Defence |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. Lilienthal (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| 1 | P-Q4 | P-Q4 |
| 2 | P-QB4 | P-K3 |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt-QB3}$ | P-QB3 |
| 4 | Kt-B3 | Kt-B3 |
|  | P-K3 |  |

tions of the Queen's Gambit associated with the move $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ and goes over to variations of the Slav Defence. Black chooses the most active variation of this defenceRubinstein's Meran Variation.

$$
5 \ldots
$$

QKt-Q2
no salvation. White lacks only one tempo. . . .
Position after White's 56th move


58 R-KKt1
P-Q7
$59 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$
Now it is clear what Smyslov still hoped for: if $59 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ then 60 R-B7 ch, K-R1; 61 R-B6, KR2; $62 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, and a draw by repetition of moves.
$59 \ldots$
R-B2
60 R(B)-KKt6
Even now, after $60 \ldots$. P-B7; $61 \mathrm{R}(6)-\mathrm{Kt5}$, White could get a draw.
60 . Resigns.

$$
\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8=\mathrm{Q}
$$

| $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

The main idea of the variation is far from new-Black intends to develop his Queen's Bishop to Kt2 and attack White's centre by playing $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$. As always in such cases, Black wins a tempo by the exchange of pawns on his QB4. Thus Rubinstein merely introduced a previously known idea into the Slav Defence.
In the given instance the struggle immediately becomes exceptionally sharp, since White, taking advantage of the fact that he has not, as in other variations of the gambit, lost
a tempo on developing the Bishop to $\mathrm{Kt5}$, can launch a dangerous offensive in the centre.

| 9 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

Black's last move is Sozin's rejoinder to Blumenfeld's plan (11 $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ).
$12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
13 O-O

This position can be found in any textbook on openings. The question arises: why did Lilienthal go in for all this variation? The further course of the game provides no clear answer. Most probably he counted on discovering something over the board. But in such sharp variations one discovers only when well acquainted with theoretical research and games previously played; but that knowledge was lacking in this case.
13 ...
Q-Q4
14 Q-K2
B-R3
$15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$

At the 13th move White avoided 13 Q-B3, recommended by theoreticians, and now he declines the Rellstab attack $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, older, but also dangerous for Black. After the text move the initiative passes to Black.

| $15 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16 \underset{\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}}{ }$ | $\mathbf{B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |
| $17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}$ |

After $17 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$; $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ ch!, B $\times$ Kt; 19 R-R7 ch, B-Kt2, White has won the exchange.
$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$
$18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is not very satisfactory in view of $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $20 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$. White gives up a pawn in order to exchange off the Bishop at R1. Left with two Bishops, he hopes for counter-play.

Position after Black's 17th move

$18 \underset{\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}}{18}$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

This move is the result of a miscalculation. Black reckoned that in the variation $19 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; $20 \mathrm{~B}-$ QKt5, R-Kt1; 21 B-R4, P-Q6; $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ White has chances of a draw, while with the King at K 2 these chances would be reduced to a minimum.
In reality, Black would have won a piece in both cases by $22 \ldots$, Q-Q5. If $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 23 B-K3, $\quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} \quad$ White also has a difficult game.

So castling was the natural and best move. But now White secures Bishops of opposite colours, which makes it very difficult for Black to win.

| 20 | B-QB4 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | B-KKt5 | Q-B4 |

Forcing events. Because of the threat $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ with exchange of Queens, White has no time to withdraw his black Bishop.
$22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch $\quad \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$
Only by retaining a good pawn formation can Black count on exploiting his pawn advantage. To 23 Q-B3 ch Black can reply $23 \ldots$, Q-B4.

| 23 | P-QKt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 24 | R-Q1 |

25 P-Kt3
K-Kt2
26 Q-B3
B-K4

If the Black pawn were at Q4 instead of Q5, Black would have no difficulty in winning. He would advance $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4-\mathrm{K} 5$, which in conjunction with the good diagonals available to the Bishop would immediately settle the issue.

## Position after Black's 26th move



Now this plan is impossible, and he has to try to increase his advantage.

Obviously the struggle must flare up around the open QR file. It is curious that White does not pay due attention to Black's attempt to capture this important file.

With move 26 Black frees his Queen and Rook from protecting the pawn and will command his QR8 square, preventing the move R-R1.

| 27 | Q-Kt7 | R-QKt1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | Q-K4 | B-B3 |
| 29 | K-Kt2 | Q-QR4 |

So the QR file is Black's. As White is avoiding the exchange of Queens (there is no point in avoiding it, as extra pieces with oppositecolour Bishops increase, as a rule, the winning chances), he moves the Queen from his KR1-QR8 diagonal.

| 30 Q-K2 | R-QR1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 R-Q3 | Q-QB4 |

Q-QB4

In such positions it is advisable to keep the Rook in front of the Queen. So Black rearranges his pieces.

| 32 Q-K4 | R-R8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 33 | R-Q2 |

White's unsystematic manœuvres have led to a further deterioration of his position.
34 Q-K2
Q-R1 ch
35 K-R3

Not, of course, 35 Q-B3, R-Kt8 ch. $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is possible, but it leads to further weakening of the position.
35 ...
R-KKt8
36 P-B4
Q-QB1

Threatening $37 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ dis. ch.

| 37 B-R6 | Q-B4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 B-Q3 | Q-Q4 |

Position after Black's 38th move


A trap. By continuing $39 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ or 39 P-QKt4, Q-Q2; 40 Q-B2, White could have resisted stubbornly.

Attempting to provoke the exchange of Rooks, he loses a second pawn, which decides the struggle. 39 R-Q1 R-Kt7!

An unpleasant surprise!
40 Q-K4
$40 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ is hopeless.

| 40 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{RP} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 42 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 43 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |

$44 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$

| Otherwise 44 |
| :--- |
| pleasant. |


| $44 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ is un- |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $45 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| $46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| $47 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $48 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $49 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| By exchanging his QP for the |  |

adverse KKtP, Black speeds up the achievement of three linked passed pawns.

| $50 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 8$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 8$ |
| 53 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| 54 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| 55 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |

White resigns. There is no defence gainst P-K4.

## NINETEEN FORTY THHREE

From 1941 to 1943 I gave all my time to my work as an engineer. During the summer I had to travel a great deal, visiting the power stations in the Urals to test high-tension insulation. During the winter I worked in the high-tension laboratory at Molotov, servicing the works of the Molotov Electricity Corporation in the repair and testing of insulations.

It may not be superfluous to remark that the insulation installations in the charge of our laboratory worked throughout this time without breakdowns.

At the beginning of 1943 I took up chess again. On Wednesdays and Saturdays I was freed from work in order to devote myself to the game. I made use of this free time to prepare for the forthcoming Masters' Tournament to be held in Sverdlovsk.

The tournament brought a group of strong masters together in competition, but, despite my two years' lack of tournament practice, I was in good form and came out first.

At the end of the year, at the invitation of the Moscow Chess Section I took part, hors concours, in the Moscow Championship. During the first part of the tournament I was defeated by Smyslov, but a good finish enabled me to come out ahead of all the competitors.

I continued to devote Wednesdays and Saturdays to chess affairs, in connection with the preparation of my book on the 1941 Match-Tournament.

SVERDLOVSK MASTERS' TOURNAMENT

## March-April

| No. 79. Sicilian Defence |  | 5 QKt--B3 | P-Q3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Botvinnik | - | $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | P-K4 |
| (White) | (Black) | One of Boleslavsky's shrewd in novations in the opening. Black achieves a satisfactory development |  |
| 1 P-K4 | P-QB4 |  |  |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-QB3 | and equalize | me; in this case |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | the weaknes | Q4 square is |
| $4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-B3 | immaterial. |  |

$7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
B-K2
Wasting no time on $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$, to prevent the manœuvre $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \times \mathrm{Kt}$; as, if $8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, B $\times$ B; $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ QP ch, K-K2, Black has a quite satisfactory position.

| 8 O-O | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Very subtly played. Otherwise 10 P-B5, and then even if Black managed to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, White would get a good base at K 4 for his minor pieces.

| $10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |

This also is perfectly satisfactory, but perhaps the simplest is $11 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ as in the given position the opening up of the Q3-R7 diagonal is of no real importance.
12 K-R1
Q-Kt3
13 Q-K2

A shrewd idea. White sacrifices a pawn, but gains several tempi and exchanges off Black's active Bishop at K3.
13 ...
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$
$14 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !

This is better, of course, than $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$.
$14 \ldots \quad B \times K t$

With gain of tempo opening up the KB file and transferring the Bishop to a better position.

## 15 ... <br> Q-Kt5

The appetite comes with eating! Even now it was not too late to play $15 \ldots$, Q-B3; $16 \mathrm{P} \times$ B, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ with counter-play. But now the initiative passes to White for a long time.
$16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$

## 17 R-R5

White does not waste time capturing the RP but transfers his Rook to
the K side for an attack. In exchange for the pawn sacrifice he gets excellently placed pieces and keeps the initiative for a long time.
Position after White's 17th move


18 B-Q4 $\quad$ B-Q1
Boleslavsky consolidates his superiority in material, as $19 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$; $20 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ is dangerous for White.
$19 \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{R})-\mathrm{KB} 5 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
Forced: otherwise $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R} ; 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}!, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R} ; 22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ with a stronger attack.

## 20 Q-Kt4 <br> Kt-K4

21 Q-Kt3
Of course, unsound is $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}!; 22 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{Q}$.
21 ..
P-B3
$22 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$
Although in this position it is difficult for Boleslavsky to display any activity, White's task is not easy, as Black has dug himself in well. The only possibility of success lies in a bayonet charge-P-KKt4-Kt5.

As will be evident later, the immediate $22 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ would give Black greater possibilities of exploiting his pawn superiority on the Q side.

## 23 Q-R3 <br> R-K1

Not allowing $24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ !

24 P-KKt4 P-KR3
25 Q-Kt3
White cannot break through without P-R4.

| 25 | R-QB1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 B-B3 | P-QR4 |
| 27 P-R4 | P-QKt4 |

Position after Black's 27th move


White's play seems to have come to a dead end. In fact, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ is not possible for the time being, while Black threatens P-QKt5 followed by R-B7.

But White has still one other hidden possibility.

## 28 Q-R3!

A quiet move, but unpleasant for Black. In view of the unstable position of his Queen at K3 there is a threat of $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$; 30 $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} ; \quad 31 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$; 32 R-B8 ch!
If Black plays $28 \ldots$..., Kt-Q2 in order to meet the Rook check by taking it with the Knight, White continues: $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ !, Q-Kt6; 30 $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 31 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$; $32 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $33 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$, with a mating attack.

The only salvation for Black is in 28 ..., K-R2! and in his turn exploiting the unsatisfactory position of the White Queen (29 P-Kt5, $\mathbf{B P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !). In this case Black probably would get equal play.

28 ... Kt-B2
This move enables White to transpose to the endgame with a Queen against two Rooks. The endgame is unfavourable to Black because of his King's open position and his broken pawns.
$29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$
An unpleasant surprise!

| $29 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30 \mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$ ch | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K t}$ |
| $31 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} 2$ |
| $32 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $33 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $34 \mathbf{P}-\mathbf{K t 5}$ |  |

As unsound as it is attractive. Of course this quickly wins a pawn, but Black manages to cut off the White King's retreat from the K side, and then the King is insecurely placed.
The correct move is $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ ! and after $34 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch} ; 35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP} ; 36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; or $35 \ldots$, P-Q4!; 36 P-Kt5, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; 37 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$; $38 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$, White would be justified in counting on the win.
$34 \ldots \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
35 Q-B5 ch
After 35 Q-Q7 ch, Kt-Kt3!; $36 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 4 ; 37 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $R(B)-Q 1$, the passive position of his King also makes it difficult for White to exploit his material advantage.

| 35 | K-Kt2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $36 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | K-R2 |
| $37 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | R-B1 ! |
| 38 Q-Q7 ch | K-Kt1 |
| 39 Q-K6 ch | K-Kt2 |
| 40 Q-Q7 ch | K-Kt1 |

40 Q-Q7 ch
K-Kt1
$41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$
$41 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ is followed by $41 \ldots$, R-QB7. White improves his King's position, but at the cost of a tempo.

[^7]Position after Black's 40th move


## $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

R(QB7)-B7
This is a decisive blunder. Now White will be able to repulse Black's Rook attack and win the game, combining defence with the advance of his central pawns. Meanwhile, after $42 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KtP}!; 43 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{KB} 7$; 44 Q-Q5 ch, R(7)-B2; $45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, it is possible that Black could have obtained a draw, as he could check along the KB file because of his passed pawn.

| No. 80. Slav Defence |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Makogonov (White) | Botvinnik (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-QB3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | Kt-KB3 |
| 5 Kt -B3 | QKt-Q2 |
| $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |  |

This "anti-Meran" variation of Rubinstein's is entirely in Makogonov's style. However, probably Rubinstein employed it simply to avoid revealing the secrets of a sound White attack in his "own" Meran Variation, whereas Makogonov always prefers continuations in which book knowledge is of little help and positional sense is everything!
$6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ has the defect that White will be forced to weaken K4.

| $43 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}(7)-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $44 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| 45 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| 46 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |

Counting on winning the KP if 47 P-K6, R-K1; 48 P-K7, K-Kt2.

## 47 P-Q4

R-B8
Again making 48 P-K6 difficult because of $48 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8$ with various threats.

| 48 Q-K4 | R(Kt)-KKt8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 49 P-Q5 | R-R8 ch |

$49 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 8$ is more "resistant."

| 50 K-Kt4 | R(R)-Kt8 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 51 K-R5 | R-B2 |
| 52 P-K6! | Resigns |

$52 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ ch is followed by $53 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, and the pawns are queened.
A game not free from mistakes, but interesting, and characteristic of Boleslavsky's inventive style.

| $6 \xrightarrow{7} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{K}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

A serious blunder, as now the development of Black's Queen's Bishop is made easier. Here Rubinstein continued $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, which is more to the point. Makogonov set himself the task of transferring his King's Bishop to B2, and for this the exchange at Q5 is certainly indispensable.
Psychologically Makogonov's mistake is quite understandable; in a game against Yudovich (Leningrad, 1939) in which Black played $8 \ldots$... B-K2, he continued $9 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ followed by B-Q3, and won. Naturally, he would not want to revise such a "successful" plan of development.
9 .
...
$\mathbf{K P} \times \mathbf{P}$
10 B-Q3
11 B-B2

Quite obviously White has not calculated all the possibilities at Black's disposal; otherwise he would play 11 O-O, which would be, perhaps, a lesser evil.
11 ...
Q-R5 ch
Position after Black's 11th move


The critical moment. Even now, by continuing $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, White would preserve a defensible position, as his basic weakness, square K 4 , is not so easily exploited. But Makogonov automatically replies 12 P KKt3, after which an exchange of the white-square Bishops is inevitable and, in conjunction with the weakness of K4, White gets a completely lost game (from the positional aspect).

## $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ <br> Q-R6

Because of the possible $13 \ldots$, QKt7 White is not able to avert B-B4; it would seem that Black should win easily. So it would have been, in all probability, if Makogonov had not suddenly begun to play with extraordinary power. He succeeded in "almost" equalizing the game, and Black had to play very subtly and exactly in order to carry the work, once begun, to its logical conclusion.
$13 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ !
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K t}$

Perfectly sound; as Black intends to occupy White's K4, the Knight must be removed.
$14 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$
B-B4
$15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$
16 P-Kt4!!

Uncommonly well played: now White's weakness in his own squares will be less perceptible. Black is faced with the dilemma: where should the Queen go: K5 or K3? If $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 5$, then $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ !!, Kt-Q6 ch; $18 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP} \mathrm{ch}$; 19 Q-B3, and the initiative passes to White. Black decides on K3, but perhaps $16 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ is more exact. as will be evident from the following play.

| 16 | $\ldots$ | Q-K3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | B-R3! | Kt-K5 ch |
| 18 | K-B3 |  |

Position after White's 18th move


It is doubtful whether Black should accept the pawn sacrifice now, as, if $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$; 19 Q-Kt3, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ (this is where the Black Queen's occupation of Q 2 would be useful; in that case Black would play $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! retaining the extra pawn and a centralized Knight!); 20 B-Kt2, O-O-O; 21 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B5}$, White would again have the initiative.

On the other hand, White intends to continue 19 P-B4. Black's situation has suddenly become not quite
so brilliant. However, he finds the way out.
$18 \ldots$
P-KR4
19 P-KR3
P-B3!

This not very noticeable move decides the struggle. White cannot exchange at KB 6 , for $20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ leads to exposure of all the weaknesses of the White King's position, vis-à-vis his pawns.

So Black in the last resort wins a pawn, while preserving his centralized Knight.

## 20 P-B4 $\quad \mathbf{R P} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch!

An important intermediary exchange; White threatened $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, after which $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$ would lead to the endgame. So Black deflects the White Queen from Q5, winning a tempo.

| $21 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |

With a threat of $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ and $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$, or simply of $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$. White cannot play $23 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ because of $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}$; so he is forced to lose time on $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, losing the K5 pawn in doing so!

| $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{QBP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| 26 Q-R4 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 27 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |

$27 \ldots$, Q-R3 would be followed by 28 Q-R5 with attack on the Rook and the strong threat Q-B7QB7 ch.
28 R-B2
For fifteen moves Makogonov has been playing brilliantly, and of course he is not averse from making one quiet move, for a "rest." Meanwhile he should have taken steps against Black's imminent attack, offering the endgame with 28 Q-R5. Now the game is decided by a direct attack on the White King.
$28 \ldots$
P-KKt3
29 B-Kt2
Makogonov again begins to exploit tactical subtleties (29 ...., $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch!, K-R1; $31 \mathrm{P}-$ Kt5) but they do not save the game.

```
29 ...
```

P-R3
$30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$
The prospect of $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} ; 31 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $32 \mathrm{R}-$ $\mathrm{B} 8, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ch!!; could not attract White, as Black mates first! Now $30 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ is followed by 31 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch!, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; 32 Q-Q8 ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$; $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$, and then White mates first.
$30 \ldots$
K-R2!
Position after Black's 30th move


This quiet move, robbing White of a tempo for doublingh is major pieces (Q-Q8 ch!) on the eighth rank, finally determines the outcome.
31 Q-R2
Q-B3
$32 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$
33 Q-Kt2
R-KB1
$34 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$
The last trick; but White has overlooked Black's 39th move.

| $34 \ldots$ | R-B7 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $35 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $36 \mathrm{~B}-\mathbf{Q} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| The only move. |  |
| 37 R-B7 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |

## 38 B-K5 <br> $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$

Now after 39 R-KKt7 dis. ch Black is left with an extra Knight.

## 39 B-B4 <br> Kt-K4!

This is the move White had not noticed.

Probably White continued his further "heroic" resistance through sheer inertia, for with the loss of the RP his outlook is hopeless.

| 40 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |
| 42 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 43 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 44 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |

Black has no reason to fear the variation $45 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; 46 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QK} 7$.
45 B-Q4
P-Kt4
46 R-R1
Q-Kt6

Here, too, the continuation 47 B-Kt6 ch, K-Q2; $48 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ !

No. 81. Sicilian Defence

| Botvinnik (White) | Kann (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | P-QB4 |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-KB3 |
| 5 QKt-B3 | P-Q3 |

In the Scheveningen Variation there are two main schemes of development of Black's pieces on the Q side: $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, or the fianchetto of the Queen's Bishop and QKt-Q2-QB4. In this game Kann chooses the second system. From the viewpoint of pressure with pieces on the centre it is quite logical.

| 6 | B-K2 | P-QR3 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 7 P-QR4 | Q-B2 |  |
| 8 P-B4 | QKt-Q2 |  |
| 9 O-O | P-QKt3 |  |
| 10 B-B3 | B-Kt2 |  |

(49 R-R6, K-Kt2) leads to further losses of material for White.

| 47 K-B2 | P-R5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $48 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | Q-B7 |
| $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | Q-K5 ch |
| $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | Q-K2 ch |
| $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | P-R6 |
| $53 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB1}$ | P-Kt5 |

White can win the Queen. . . .!
$54 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch!
. . . but Black gets a new Queen! It was still possible to lose all by 54 ..., P-Kt6; $55 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 56 B-B5 ch!
$55 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad$ P-Kt6
White resigns.
In this game Makogonov displayed exceptional tenacity, which is not surprising: this game, played in the last round of the first part, decided the leadership of the tournament.

## $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$

Position after White's 11 th move


An unpleasant blow for Black. White exploits the absence of the Bishop from B1 to attack the KP. As Black cannot allow a file to be opened so long as he has not completed development, he is forced to weaken his Q4.

[^8]
## $12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

Kt-B4
Kann probably assumed that this move would force an exchange at QB5, which would ease his defence. But he was to suffer a disappointment.
In a later Romanovsky-Kann game (Moscow, 1947) the continuation 12 . ., B-K2; 13 Q-K2, O-O; $14 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, QR-B1; $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{KR}-$ K1 followed by P-Q4 led to a favourable position for Black. However, that game is unconvincing, as Romanovsky did not decide on the logical continuation $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ (or $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ ). It is permissible to ask why White went in for all this energetic variation, if he could not bring himself to move $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$ after Black had Castled on that side?

## 13 Q-K2!

A second unpleasantness! It transpires that $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 14$ $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is unfavourable to Black, and White is the first to exploit the open QB file!

| $13 \ldots$ | B-K2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $14 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | P-R3 |

Here Black is faced with a difficult question: on which side should he Castle? On the K side is dangerous, as a pawn storm of his K side begins (P-KKt4-Kt5). The Q side also is not safe, owing to the lack of a reliable pawn screen. So Kann decides to leave the King in the centre; but here too the King comes under fire!
15 B-Q2 $\quad$ R-Q1

After Black has deprived the Queen's Bishop of KKt 5 this is the only, and a good means of bringing the Bishop into the fight.
$16 \ldots$
Q-B1
An unfortunate idea which uses several tempi and costs Black the
game. As early as the 12 th move Kann had attempted to provoke a Knight exchange at B5; now he genuinely "compels" this exchange after the transfer of the Queen to QR1, and gets a lost position. $16 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ is better.

$$
17 \text { R-Q1 } \quad \text { Q-R1 }
$$

Position after Black's 17th move

$18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
After this move events develop violently. $18 \ldots, \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is really better, but even that would give White clear positional superiority owing to the weakness of Black's white squares Q4 and QB5.
19 B-Kt3!
$R \times R$
$\mathbf{Q}$
$20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
Q-Kt1

Black is unable to defend the KP with the Knight, it would weaken his Q4. But now White, forcing the exchange at his Q5, intensifies the pressure on the KP, which, in conjunction with the unsatisfactory position of the Black King, is of decisive importance.

| $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

This is really the only move. Bad are both $22 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, and $22 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$; $24 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, and $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$. Now Black proposes to close up the position with $23 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ and so get a satisfactory defence.

## 23 P-B6! <br> P-Kt3

Objectively the best. After $23 \ldots$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$, followed by $25 \mathrm{~B}-$ R4, and 26 R-KB1, White wins back a pawn, while retaining all the advantages of his situation.

## $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KP}$

The obvious move, which of course Black foresaw. 24 ..., B $\times$ B can be followed by either $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, or by the more resolute $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$. And so Black loses an important central pawn, but he does not yet lose hope of saving the game, as the White QP is blocked.

## 24 ... <br> K-Q1

As an idea, this is sound: the King is placed best of all on the Q file; but Black overlooks White's 26th move, after which the White pawns come to life and the game transposes to a hopeless endgame for Black. To be fair, we must note that with the other continuation: 24 ..., K-Q2; $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ! (this Bishop must be preserved), R-K1; 26 Q-B4 (26 . ., B $\times$ RP; 27 P-Q6), Black's situation would be anything but good.

| 25 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}!$ |$\quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$

Position after White's 26th move


A terrible check! The endgame is hopeless for Black, though it is by
no means simple for White to win, owing to the closed nature of the position.
26 ...
$\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$
$27 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ ch $\quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

Of course, not $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$, because of 28 P-Q6 ch.

| $28 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | B $\times$ B |
| :---: | :---: |
| $29 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | P-KKt |

Facilitates the win. The weakening of Black's KB4 and KR4 squares opens up ways for the White King's breakthrough.
31 R-Q5!
On this square the Rook is invulnerable.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | R-KKt1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | K-Kt3 | P-B3 |
| 33 | K-Kt4 | K-K3 |

34
K-K3

## 34 K-R5!

White's plan is simple: to win one more pawn, and then, surrendering the K and Q pawns, to transpose to a pawn endgame. The KRP is indefensible; $34 \ldots, \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ is followed by $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$.

| $34 \ldots$ | P-QR4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $35 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | K-B2 |
| 36 K-R5 | R-R1 ch |
| 37 K-Kt4 | R-R5 ch |

But now if $38 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$, then $38 \ldots$, R-B5 mate!

| 38 | K-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 | P-KB4 |
| 40 | K $\times$ P 1 |
|  | P $\times \mathbf{P}$ ch |
| K-K3 |  |

The time has come to transpose to the pawn endgame.

| 41 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| 43 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 44 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | Resigns |

$44 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ is followed most simply by $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ !, K-K3; $46 \mathrm{P}-$ R4, P-B4; 47 K-Kt5!, K-K4; 48 P-R5, P-B5; 49 P-R6, P-B6; $50 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$; $51 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch}$ !

## MOSCOW CHAMPIONSHIP

December

No. 82. Ruy Lopez

|  | V. Lublinsky (White) | M. Botvi <br> (Black) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | P-K4 | P-K4 |
| 2 | Kt-KB3 | Kt-QB3 |
| 3 | B-Kt5 | P-QR3 |
| 4 | B-R4 | Kt-B3 |
|  | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |

This continuation leaves White barely any advantage; its point is that after $5 \ldots, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{B}$; $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ Black cannot play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, which is regarded as the strongest.

| 5 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| 8 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 9 | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

A position has arisen similar to those which were frequently met with in Tchigorin's games playing this opening; as is well known, the open QKt file and the two Bishops completely make up for the weakness of Black's pawns on the $\mathbf{Q}$ side. Possibly Black's play has the greater prospects.

| $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | R-Kt1 |

To continue after 12 Kt -B5 with $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ and then $13 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ and $14 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$.

| 12 | P-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 | B-K3 |
| 14 | P-B3 |
| 15 | Q-B2 |
| 16 | R-Kt3 |
| 17 | PR-Q1 |
|  | Kt-K1 |

This manœuvre takes a lot of time, and the initiative passes to White. The sound move is $17 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, and if $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$, then Black transfers
the Knight to his Q5 square without delay.

| 18 Kt -Q3 3 Kt-B5 | $26 \mathrm{Kt-K2}$ | B-B1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 P-KB3 3 B-R3 | $27 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 20 P-QB4 P-QB4 | 28 B-B2 | P-QB4 |
| Almost forced! | 29 R-KB1 | P-B4 |
|  | $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | B-Q2 |
| 21 Q-Q2! | 31 QR-Q1 | P-B5 |
| Excellently played. In view of the | $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | P-Kt4 |
| threats $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ and $22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | 33 P-KKt4 |  |

threats $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ and $22 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ Black must exchange the Knight, after which the QB and QR pawns will be very weak.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

Position after White's 25th move

$25 \ldots$
R-Q5!!
The only way of saving the B4 pawn. It is difficult for White to exploit his material superiority when there are no open files, and Black has good chances on the K side. Best of all for White would be to take the Rook with the Bishop and then transfer the Knight to Q3.
We must remark that this sacrifice of the exchange ( $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ !!) is possible only because Black will still have one Rook, without which his Bishops
would not be dangerous. This is why Black could not delay with this sacrifice; if White exchanged one pair of Rooks he would ensure himself the win.

White's nerves fail him. The threat P-Kt5 was very unpleasant, but this weakening of the K side helps Black in his attack.
33 .
$34 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$
$\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ e.p.
$\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{R} 6$
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$
$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 5$
P
36 R(B)-Q2
R-KB1
Black's attack is developing step by step. White's pieces are placed very unsatisfactorily.

| 38 R-Q3 | R-B5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 K-R1 | K-R2 |
| 40 R-KKt1 | B-Q1 |

No. 83. French Defence

| A. Tolush | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | P-K4 | P-K3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | P-Q4 | P-Q4 |
| 3 | Kt-QB3 | B-Kt5 |
| 4 | P-K5 | P-QB4 |
| 5 | P-QR3 | B $\times$ Kt ch |

Seemingly 5 ..., B-R4 is also perfectly playable.

$$
6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2
$$

One of the most telling variations of the French Defence. Tolush goes on to play the opening in accordance with the "last word" of theory, as it stood on January 1st, 1944! Present-

41 Q-K2
Q-KB2
42 Q-Q1
All White's misfortune consists in the fact that $42 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; 43 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 44 \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{B}, \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$; $45 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 46 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 47 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 4, \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 48$ Q-Kt1, Q-K7 leads to the loss of the KP!
$42 \ldots$
Q-R4
43 B-K3

Otherwise $43 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ would be decisive. The endgame with Bishops of opposite colours is a lost one for White, as Black gets two united passed pawns.

| 43 | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch |
| :---: | :---: |
| $44 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $45 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $46 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | R-K6 |
| $47 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$ |
| $48 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ | R-K7 |
| 49 R-Q1 | B-Kt5 |
| $50 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $51 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ | B-B4 |
| $52 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | P-Q6 |
| $53 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{RP}$ | P-R6 |
| Resigns |  |

day theoreticians recommend 7 QKt4.

| 7 Kt -B3 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $8 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

A very useful move, securing a good position at R3 for the Queen's Bishop.

| 8 | $\ldots$ | B-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | B-K2 | Q-B2 |
| 10 | O-O | P-QKt3 |
| 11 | B-R3 | Kt-R4 |

In a Smyslov-Botvinnik game, played at Sverdlovsk in 1943, this position had $11 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$, which after $12 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 13 \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; 15 $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{B}$ led to a difficult position for

Black. However, many masters considered that $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ gives Black good play.

Position after Black's 11th move

$12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ !
An important improvement by Tolush. White plans to play 13 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, provoking the Knight exchange, after which White's pawn formation on the Q side is corrected.
12 ...
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$
13 P-QB4!

Finely played. White clears the central squares, and his two Bishops become a threatening force. On the other hand, there would be little satisfaction for him in $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B} ; 14 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, because of $14 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and Black has to all intents and purposes an extra pawn at R2.
$13 \ldots$
B-Q2

An inexact move, leading to a difficult position. He should have chosen $13 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, and if 14 $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ;$ $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$; $17 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, then $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| 14 | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| 16 | $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$ |

$17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KtP}$
Q $\times$ K $\mathbf{P}$

The critical moment. $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{QP}$ ! is much stronger. If then $17 \ldots, \mathrm{~K} t \mathrm{P} \times$ P; $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt2}$, White would
reply: $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; or if $17 \ldots$,. $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$, then $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$.

The exchange in the text leads to an equal game.

Position after Black's 16th move


17

| 17 | $\cdots$ | RP $\times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $18 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | KR-K1 |  |
| $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | Q-B3 |  |
| $20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | Kt-B4 |  |
| $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | Q-Q5 |  |
| 22 | Q-K2 | Kt-R5 |

22 O-K2 Kt-R5
A risky move. $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$ is simpler.
23 QR-Q1
Q-B5
24 Q-Q2

Having in mind the continuation, dangerous for Black: 25 B-Kt2 followed by $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ and $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$.

Position after White's 24th move

$24 \ldots$
Q-R5!
A difficult, but the only reply. In
view of the potential Knight transfer 25 ..., Kt-B5, White's Bishop at R3 cannot reach the QR1-KR8 diagonal.

| 25 | B-B1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Q-B4 |$\quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$

26 Q-Q4 is considerably better. Now the initiative passes to Black.

| $26 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt-Kt3}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

Threatening to win a piece: 28 $\ldots, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; and $30 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ is out of the question because of $30 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch. The sound defence consists in $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, but even then Black would retain the advantage.
White's next move is mistaken, as it weakens the first rank.
28 R-Q4
Q-B7
29 P-R4

Hazardous and quite in Tolush's style. He always aims at counterplay.
29 ...
R-R8
$30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$

Loses swiftly, but it is doubtful whether White has any satisfactory defence.

| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $32 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |  |

P-R5
If $32 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ the following finish is possible: $32 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 ; 34 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch; with the unavoidable $35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$.

| 32 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{B}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 8$ |
| 34 | Q-Kt8 |  |

An interesting position.
$34 \ldots \quad$ R-R8 ch
35 K-Kt3 Q-Kt8

Black's attack is the more weighty.

| 36 | R-Kt8 ch | K-R3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | B-Kt4 | Q-R7 ch |
| 38 | K-B3 | Kt $($ B5 $)-\mathrm{K} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 39 | K-K2 | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathbf{B} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 40 | R $\times$ B | $\mathbf{Q} \times$ RP |
|  | Resigns |  |

A stormy game, but not without mistakes!

## NINETEEN FORTY-FOUR

At the beginning of this year I transferred to work in the Technical Department of the Ministry for Electric Power Stations, and moved with my family to Moscow.

In the early summer the first wartime U.S.S.R. Championship Tournament was held, at Moscow. There were many who considered that the fight for first place in this tournament would lie between me and Smyslov. They were right. Smyslov began brilliantly. Our meeting in the middle of the tournament (Game No. 86, infra) aroused perhaps even more interest than my meeting with Kotov had in 1939. Smyslov was defeated, and was so demoralized as the result that afterwards he failed to put up any strong opposition to me.

Some months later I completed my task of annotating and editing the games of the Match-Tournament for the Absolute Championship, which perhaps has been my best analytical work to date.

## SOVIET CHAMPIONSHIP

June
No. 84. Nimzo-Indian Defence

## G. Veresov

(White)

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

$5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Veresov's own happy idea: in the usual continuation $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3$; 7 B-R4 Black is able to play $7 \ldots$, P-QB4 (with the Bishop placed at R4), while if, after $7 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, White exchanges at KB6, he loses a tempo.

But now, if Black plays P-B4, White can exchange at B6 without losing time.

| 6 | —. | P-B4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | B-Kt5 | P-KR3 |
| 8 | B $\times$ Kt | Q $\times$ B |
| 9 | P-QR3 | B-R4 |

Position after Black's 9th move


A weak reply. Now White has two good possibilities: (1) $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ !, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 11 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $12 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$, and Black must work very hard to win back the pawn. (2) 10 P-QKt4! (pointed out by Veresov immediately the game had ended), $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KtP}$; $11 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ (11
..., Q-B3; $12 \mathrm{Kt-Kt5}, \mathrm{B-Kt3;}$ $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ is clearly in White's favour); $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3 ; 13$ $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P} \mathrm{ch} ; 14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times$ Kt ch; $15 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 16 \mathrm{~K}-\mathbf{Q} 2$, and Black's pawns on the Q side may come under attack. So Black should have played $9 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$.

In the hope of winning still greater superiority White avoids these variations and goes in for complications. But he chooses such an unfortunate plan that the "complications" prove difficult only for White.

## 10 O-O-O

Here the King will be far from secure, but most of all White has lost precious time and has not taken the QBP. Of course Black does not miss the chance of eliminating this threat.

| $10 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5!$ |

The only convincing continuation. As $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ would be very dangerous for White because his King is on the Q side, he is forced to seek other ways of retaining the initiative. $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ! suggests itself, in the hope that it will be followed by $12 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 13 \mathrm{Kt-K5}$ ! and then $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; but $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ would in fact be met by $12 \ldots$, B-Kt5!; $13 \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$; $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; and, despite White's temporary superiority in material, Black's game is to be preferred.
After long consideration White chooses another-and perhaps er-roneous-plan, associated with reinforcing the Knight at K5 and advancing pawns on the $K$ side.

| 12 Q-K3 ch | B-K3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 Kt-K5 | Kt-B3 |
| 14 P-KKt4 |  |

Of course $14 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$;

15 P-Q5, O-O-O is in Black's favour. Assuming that Black would Castle short, Veresov begins a pawn advance on the K side.
14 ...

$$
\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}!
$$

This is now quite obvious! Of course Black does not Castle short, as on that side his King's position would swiftly be shattered.

## 15 P-B4

Position after White's 15 th move


This "energetic" move proves to be a fatal mistake, as it irrevocably weakens K4 and K3 squares along the half-open K file. White still assumes that his central Knight gives him superiority. But in reality Black had to make only three moves (KR-K1, Q-K2 and P-B3), and then White would be left with only the memory of his strongly-placed Knight. If White had foreseen this threat he would not of course have wasted time on $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$.
It is quite common for a Knight at K5 to lead one into error when estimating a position. On studying Game No. 92, which I played against Lilienthal, a year later, the reader will be convinced that history sometimes repeats itself.

Here the sound move is either 15 B-Kt2, or 15 P-KR4 followed by 16 B-R3.
15.

KR-K1

Winning a tempo, because of the threat $16 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$. $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ at once is much weaker, for $16 \ldots$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is not playable with the Rook at R1.

White at the moment has no choice, as $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ leads to loss of a pawn.
16 Q-KB3 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$
17 P-K3
In fighting to defend his weak K3 square, White has fallen into such a great error that the decisive blow comes only three moves later-his Queen is cut off from the Q side.

The continuation $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $18 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}, \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP} ; 20 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Ktl}$ is also unsatisfactory for White. 17 $\mathbf{K t} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is a lesser evil, but this opens the QKt file and leads to new dangers for the White King.
17 ...
Kt-R4!
Immediately exploiting White's blunder. At R4 the Knight will be very active; White's central Knight will be driven off to the $K$ side, where now there is a complete lull.

White still cannot continue 18 P B5 because of $18 \ldots$, B-Q2; 19 $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{QP}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ ch! and Black wins the Queen.

| 18 B-Kt2 | P-B3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 19 Kt-Kt6 | Q-QB2 |
| 20 | K-Kt1 |

Position after Black's 20th move


An unexpected stroke; it might seem that so long as the King and Queen are on the B file this move is impossible, because of $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$; but White is foiled by the awkward position of his Queen at KB3.

Now Black's QBP threatens to advance farther. $21 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ loses at once because of $21 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and there is no satisfactory defence against $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ or $22 \ldots$, B-B2; $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$.

So Veresov decides to surrender the exchange in hope of saving himself in the endgame. This, of course, drags out the struggle-for 25 moves-but cannot alter the result.

| $21 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |

The two Queens are simultaneously doomed, but Black wins the exchange!

| $23 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Q} 1)-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 28 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 29 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| $32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $33 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
|  |  |

Despite Black's superiority in
No. 85. Réti Opening

|  | Botvinnik Flohr <br>  (White) | (Black) |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |

Since one of the games in the Alekhine-Euwe return match 7 ...,
pieces he still has to overcome quite a few technical difficulties, owing to his Rook being insufficiently active. Now he experiences some difficulty owing to the weakness of his KRP; so he decides to take steps betimes to defend it.
If White were to play a waiting game the struggle might go on for a long time yet. But during timetrouble for both parties he decided to "nish in troubled waters," and . . . now loses quickly.


Now the Rook has gained freedom of action.

| 38 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt6} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 40 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 41 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 42 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ |  |

Now in any case White could have resigned; for the time-check was past.

| 42 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 43 | B-B2 | K-B4 |
| 44 | B-B5 | P-R4 |
| 45 | B-B2 | B-B3 |
|  | Resigns |  |

P-K4 has been recommended as the strongest. It is unquestionably sound, but now I decided to try out a certain "new idea."

| 8 B-K3 | Q-Q1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Perhaps 8 | Q-Q3 is better. |
| $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | Kt -B3 |
| $10 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | B-K2 |
| $11 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |  |

A little later in this same tournament Lisitsin playing Mikenas continued 11 P-B4 at once. Probably
this is more exact, as now Flohr could play $11 \ldots$, B-KB4, achieving satisfactory development.
11 ...
12 P-B4


This is the opening idea I had in mind. The flanking BP is exchanged for the central KP; White obtains a half-open KB file; and, finally, the backward QP will become a strong central pawn.

| $12 \ldots$ | $P \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $14 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

A sound scheme of defence. Black transfers the Bishop to $\mathrm{KKt3}$, after which his K side will be securely covered.

| 15 | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 Q-Q2 | B-KKt5 |
| 17 B-B5 | B-R4 |
| 18 QR-KB1 | Q-B2 |
| 19 R-R4 |  |

A quite harmless demonstration: after the Bishop's transfer to Kt3 the Black King has become very inaccessible.

| 19 | KR-K1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | Q-Q1 |
| $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |

Dangerous is $21 \ldots, \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{B}$; $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$; and the Knight at B 3 .is pinned because of the potential threat R-R8 ch and Q-R6 ch. By
keeping the RP Black foils all White's attempts to attack the King. However, arising out of his pawn superiority on the Q side, White has some cause to reckon on success in the endgame.
22 R-R3
Q-Q2
23 P-QR3

Safeguarding square K4.

| $23 \ldots$ | QR-Q1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | Q-K3! |

Quite in Flohr's style. Black provokes the formation of a passed QP, securely blocks it and develops counter-play with pieces.

| $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $26 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |

As the Rook at KB1 is undefended Black gains a tempo to block the QP.

| $27 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| $31 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ |

Flohr has always played such positions artistically; take as an example his game against Steiner, at Hastings in 1932/33, and the first game of his match with me in 1933. It would be difficult to improve on the position of White's pieces.

| $32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ |
| $35 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |
| $35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | should have |
| played.at once. |  |
| $35 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $37 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |

$37 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5$ ! is stronger, as if 38 Q-Q3, Q-B4 ch, and $39 \ldots$, R-Q5 Black wins a pawn and has even the slightly superior position. The inexact play of both sides at this stage was the result of time trouble.
38 R-Q1 R-B3

| $39 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $40 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |

The last move in the time-check. It was psychologically difficult to decide on $40 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$, as throughout the game Black had aimed to block the QP at Q5; but the King's move would have been better, as, to begin with, the QP could always be halted at Q7; secondly, the Black King would come up in time; and, thirdly, the White King would fail to support the passed pawn.

| 41 K-B2 | K-Kt1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 42 K-K3 | K-B2 |
| 43 R-B1 ch! |  |

Position after White's 43rd move


43
R-B3
A blunder, and all the more surprising because it was made immediately after the adjournment, in other words, after there had been opportunity for analysis.

Flohr assumed that after 43 ..., K-K2; 44 K-Q4, R-Kt3; $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$, R-Kt4 ch; 46 K-B4, R-Kt3; 47 R-B4 the endgame was a lost one for Black. In reality, after 47 ..., P-KR4! followed by $48 \ldots$, R-KB3 Black had every reason to count on a draw.

White could make another attempt to win, transposing play into a pawn endgame by $47 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1 \mathrm{ch}$ (instead of $47 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4), \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $48 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $49 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$. In
that case an exceptionally interesting pawn finish would result.

Position in variation after $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$


Despite Black's extra pawn White's position is superior because of his King's active position. As will be seen from the following variations, if Black plays a waiting game and defends his $\mathbf{Q}$ side with his King, he loses through Zugszwang.
(1) $50 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$, K-B1; 52 P-R4!!, K-Kt1; $53 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 54 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; 55 K-B5, K-Q2; $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 57 P-QKt3, K-Kt1; 58 P-QKt4, K-R1; 59 K-B7, K-R2; 60 P-Kt5, K-R1; 61 P-Kt6, P-R4; 62 P-Kt3 and wins.

But if Black plays actively, with the object of capturing the White QKtPs at the cost of his own QR and QKtPs, he still loses, as White can capture all Black's K side pawns while preserving his own KKtP.
(2) $50 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$; $51 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 4 ; 52 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$ !! (a draw follows 54 K-Kt6, e.g. 54 ..., K-Kt6; $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$; $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $58 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $59 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $60 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 61 K-Kt6, K-K6; 62 K-B5, K-B7), $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$; $55 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $56 \mathrm{~K}-$ B4, K-B7; $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6$; 58 $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$; $59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$; $60 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, and wins.
(3) 50
 K-K4; 51 K-Kt6, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $52 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $54 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$; $55 \mathrm{~K}-$ B6, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$; 57 K-K6, K-Q5; 58 K-B7, P-Kt4 (58 ..., K-K6; $59 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 7$; $60 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $61 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ); 59 $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ and then as in the preceding variation.

However, a certain little known amateur pointed out that Black could save the game with 50 ..., P-R4!! Then, if White plays 51 K-Kt6 at once (as in the second variation above) Black gets a draw, as White lacks $54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$. But if White first plays $51 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$, then after 51 ..., K-K4; $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$; $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; 54 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; 55 K-Kt6, K-Kt6; 56 K-B5, K $\times$ P; 57 K-Q4, K-Kt6; 58 K-K5, K-B5; 59 K-K6, K-Q5; 60 K-B7, K-K5; $61 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{KtP}(3), \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $62 \mathrm{~K} \times$ RP, K-Kt6; 63 K-Kt5, K $\times$ KtP; 64 P-R5, K-Kt6; 65 K-Kt6, K-Kt5, Black achieves a draw easily.

The pawn endgame which occurs in the text is won comparatively simply.

| $44 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $45 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}+4!$ |$\quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$

White immediately takes steps to clear the QKt1-KR7 diagonal for his King.

| 45 | $\ldots$ | K-K2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46 | P-R4 | K-Q3 |
| 47 | K-K4 | P-QKt3 |
| 48 | P-R5 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |


| No. 86. French Defence |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| V. Smyslov (White) | M. Botvinnik (Black) |
| P-K4 | P-K3 |
| P-Q4 | P-Q4 |
| Kt-QB3 | B-Kt5 |
| P-K5 | P-QB4 |
| P-QR3 | B $\times$ Kt ch |

$49 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
P-QR4
50 K-B5
Here a second solution is possible: $50 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $51 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt3}$ !, K-B4; $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; 54 K-Kt6, K-B6; $55 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; 56 K-Kt6, P-R5; 57 P-R6, P-R6; 58 P-R7, P-R7; 59 P-R8 (Q).

| 50 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 51 | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |
| $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{RP}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| $54 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

Or 54 ..., P-Kt4; 55 K-R7, K-B2; 56 P-R6. Black's further resistance is pointless.

| 55 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $56 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $57 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3$ |
| $58 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $59 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |
| $60 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $61 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $62 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
|  | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

This position is to be found in all beginners' textbooks.

| 63 | K-R5 | K-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 64 | K-Kt5 | K-R2 |
| 65 | K-B6 | K-R3 |
| 66 | P-Kt4 | K-R2 |
| 67 | P-Kt5 | K-Kt1 |
| 68 | K-Kt6 | Resigns |

The value of this game was diminished by mistakes on both sides during the 35th to 40 th moves. But for these mistakes it would have been a decidedly interesting endgame!

| $6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | QKt-B3 |
| $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

I first employed this variation (for Black) in a game against Milner-Barry, at Hastings in 1934. It has since been req.larly adopted in master play. Smyslov had frequently expressed his view that the system is
bad for Black, so I now had particular satisfaction in employing it.
8 ...
Q-R4
9 B-Q2
Here 9 Q-Q2, not avoiding a possible exchange of Queens, is logical. But White aims to decide the game by an attack on the K side.
9 ...
P-B5
$10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
I pointed out the manœuvre Kt -Kt5-R3-B4-R5 in 1939, in notes to the Pogrebyssky-Botvinnik game. (See No. 63, supra.) Black here does not allow the Knight to reach R5.

| $10 \ldots$ | P-KR3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $12 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $14 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

Position after Black's 14th move


The result of the opening can be summarized as not favourable to White. He must lose his QRP. Trué, he can launch a pawn attack on the K side, but Black has sufficient defensive resources.

| 15 P-R4 | B $\times$ P |
| :---: | :---: |
| 16 P-R5 | Q-Kt4 |

17 K-Q1 R-QB1
The simplest means of bringing the QR into play. After this White must lose several more tempi in dealing with the attack on his King.

18 B-B1
R-B3
19 B-K2
A number of masters condemned this move and recommended 19 P Kt4 immediately. I think that if Black plays soundly this is of no essential importance.
19 ...
R-R3
$20 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
A great achievement for Black! Now the QB1-KR6 diagonal is closed to White's Bishop.
$20^{\circ} \ldots \quad O-O$
This move is definitely playing into White's hands, as Black is forced into 21 ..., P-B3, and the White Queen gets freedom to move along the KR2-QKt8 diagonal. So far Black was not exposed to any danger; his King was adequately secure in the centre, and instead of playing for a trap ( $21 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !; $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ ) he should have played for simplification with $20 \ldots$, Q-Q2 and $21 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, or by way of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ and $21 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$.

| $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $23 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |

24 Q-Q8
K-R2
25 P-B4!
With the strong threat of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}-$ Kt6 ch. After thinking over this position for more than thirty minutes I came to the conclusion that one should play $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ with approximate equality, as if the White KKtP advances Black's Knight is always ready to occupy B4.

None the less I decided to try my luck and took a cunning, but extremely dangerous variation.
$25 \ldots \quad$ Q-R4
Offering an exchange of Queens without disarranging the pawn formation.

NINETEEN FORTY-FOUR
26 Q-Kt8
Kt-B3
27 Q-K8
R-K2
28 Q-Kt6 ch

Smyslov made this move without thinking. Evidently he assumed that 28 Q-KB8 led to an exchange of Queens, while the text move left White the possibility of making a decisive attack on the King. This was a serious error; it was in the very continuation $28 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 8, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $29 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, that White retained good prospects, as it would not be so simple to transfer the Black Knight to KB4. The text move draws the White Queen into a trap!
$28 \ldots \quad$ K-Kt1
Position after Black's 28th move


29 B-R3
White still does not notice the danger threatening his Queen, otherwise he would have played $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5} \times \mathrm{P}$ at once, so securing the Queen's retreat. True, even in this case Black has the better game, but now his task is simplified.


This defence against the $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
$29 \ldots$
P-K4
Very riskily played! At first I intended to play $29 \ldots$, Q-B2, but the variation $30 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{KB} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $31 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 1$; $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $33 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 7$ is bad for Black. I should have chosen $29 \ldots$, Q-B2; $30 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{KB} 1, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ !; $31 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 1$ and then it is doubtful whether White could save the game.
$30 \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$
This is a decisive error. If he continues $30 \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$, White should by no means lose. For if Black continued as in the text the White BP would be preserved and would guarantee White equal play.

| $30 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ |
| $32 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $33 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |  |

The winning move; this is where the lack of the BP tells!

| $34 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ |

$35 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ is also playable. Here there is more than one solution to the problem.

| 36 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| 38 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 39 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $40 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 40 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
|  | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |

White sealed $41 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 1$, but did not bother to resume. The struggle developed interestingly, but the game would have been of even greater interest if there had not been errors on both sides in the final stage.
variation first appeared in Soviet master play in 1940. Boleslavsky's employment of it is its best recommendation. Unfortunately, in the present game he did not overcome the difficulties of the opening.

[^9]The basic idea of the $3 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$ QB3 defence is a struggle for White's K5. In the present game White attempts to counter this idea with free development of pieces.

| 6 | $\ldots$ | P-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | B-QKt5 | B-K2 |
| 8 | B-KB4 |  |

B-KB4
White has achieved a good arrangement of his pieces. Now he can exchange at KB6, as his command of the half-open K file and the KR2QKt8 diagonal enables him to control his K5.

| $8 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |

If Black recaptures with a piece, White gets a base at K5. But even now Black is not free from difficulties. To advance the KP would lead to White's capture of KB5, and it is impossible to advance the BP because it would weaken square K 4 .

| 10 | O-O | Kt-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | R-K1 | B-Q3 |
| 12 | B-Kt3 | P-QR3 |
| 13 | B-Q3 | Kt-R5 |

Not only attacking the KtP, but preventing the possible $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$.

14 R-Kt1
P-Kt4
Position after Black's 14th move


It would seem that Black has
played quite sensibly, for he prevents the undermining move $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$. But this is offset by the weakening of his QB4. So long as the Bishop is at Q3 this weakness is not perceptible; Black assumed that if White took the Bishop he would reply $P \times B$, and all would be well. But by tactical devices White soon succeeds in forcing Black to take at Q3 with his Queen.
15 P-B3
B-Q2
$16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ !

A vital moment. Exploiting the fact that the Black KP cannot be advanced because it would weaken square KB4, White starts active operations against the Black King,

| $16 \ldots$ | R-B2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 R-K3 | R-Kt2 |
| 18 Q-K2 |  |

A fresh unpleasantness for Black a sacrifice of exchange at K6 may become possible. If in doing so White succeeds in winning two pawns, it will be clearly to his advantage, taking into account the weakness arising at Black's KB4.
18 ...
Q-KB1
$19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$
$\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$

Sad, but necessary. $19 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ might be followed by $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$, $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{R} ; 21 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}$ ch, and one of the two QPs is lost. So Black has suffered defeat in the fight for his QB4.

## 20 R-Kt3 <br> $$
\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}
$$

This too is necessary. Otherwise Black is unable to parry the threat: $21 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$; $22 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, K-Kt1; $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$.

| $21 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{R}$ | Q-K2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | Q-Kt2 |
| 23 Q-B2 | Kt-Q1 |
| $24 \mathrm{Kt-B1}$ |  |

Preventing the QBP's advance to

B4, and if opportunity offers, planning to carry through the manœuvre Kt-K2-B4.

| 24 | $\ldots$ | R-B1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | P-Kt3 | Kt-Kt3 |
| 26 | P-QKt4 | R-R1 |
| 27 | Kt-Kt3 |  |

After 27 Kt-K2 Black would probably decide on $27 \ldots$, P-K4, and because of the awkward position of the Knight at K2 White's superiority would be less perceptible.
27 ...
$\mathbf{K t}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$
Position after Black's 27th move


An imperceptible error which proves to be decisive. Now Black's Bishop is thrust back to QB1. He should have played $27 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-R5.

$29 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$
Kt-R5

## No. 88. Réti Opening

| G. Lisitsin | M. Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | Kt-KB3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |

A well-known opening error. It is strange that Lisitsin should have committed it, for he had thoroughly studied the Réti Opening.

29 ..., Kt-B5 gives stronger resistance, as the Knight would be more actively placed.

## 30 P-B6

B-B1
Alas! $30 \ldots, \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P} ; 31 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K P}$, and White has KB5.

## 31 P-QB4!

Getting rid of the weakness at QB3 and supporting the pawn at QB6.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | $K t P \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ | Kt-Kt3 |
| 33 | B-Q3 | R-Kt1 |
| 34 | Q-B5 | Q-B1 |

Black hopes to ransom himself at the cost of the KRP and bring about the endgame. In fact he does succeed in exchanging Queens, but in circumstances unfavourable to himself

| $35 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}!$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| $38 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $39 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $40 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |

It was high time to bring down the curtain.

| 41 | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 42 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ |
| 43 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 44 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |
| 45 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{P} 6$ |
| 46 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6$ |
|  | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
|  | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
|  |  |
| $3 \ldots$ | Resigns |
|  |  |
|  |  |

White cannot prevent the formation of Black's pawn centre.

$$
4 \text { P-K3 P-K4 }
$$

$5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$
Or $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \quad \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 6 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-K5; $7 \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, in Black's favour.

| 5 | K | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 O-O | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

White wants to play $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ and at the same time preserve his King's Bishop, so this move is perfectly natural.

| $7 \ldots$ | KKt-K2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 P-Q3 | B-K3 |
| 9 QKt-Q2 | P-QKt3 |

As a prophylactic against $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ followed by $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, in reply to which the Bishop's retreat to B2 is now possible.


Imprudently played. Now Black can intensify the pressure in the centre. White should first have played $14 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$.

| 14 | B-Kt5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 B-K2 | P-B4 |
| 16 Kt-Kt3 | P-K5 |

Black had a good choice:
(1) $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{BP}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; and 19 ..., Kt-K4.
(2) $16 \quad \ldots, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; \quad 17 \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$.
(3) $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$; and $18 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}$-B4.

The text continuation seems the
most promising, as Black gets a passed QP.
$17 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{KP} \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}(\mathrm{Kt} 3)$
Very attractive is $17 \ldots, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 19 \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$ (dangerous: $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ), Kt Kt3 with a strong attack.

| 18 | $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{BP} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |
| 20 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $21 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |  |

Not an entirely successful manœuvre; 21 ..., QR-Q1 and then $22 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ is more logical.

| 22 Kt-Kt3 | QR-KB1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 R-KB1 | Q-B2 |
| 24 QR-K1 | P-Q6 |
| 25 B-Q1 | Kt-K4 |

Black needs only to make one more move - Kt(K2)-QB3 - for White to be in Zugszwang. However, Lisitsin finds a shrewd way of freeing his pieces.
$\begin{array}{lll}26 & \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}! & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} \\ 27 & \text { Kt-R1! } & \end{array}$
Black is not able to prevent 28 P-B4, after which chances are almost equal. So he opens up the game on the K side, in order to create a few tactical complications.

| $27 \ldots$ | P-KR4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 P-B4 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ e.p. |
| $29 \mathrm{P} \times$ BP | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $30 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |
| 31 R-B2 |  |

So far Lisitsin had conducted a difficult defence very well, but now his positional sense betrayed him. He evidently assumed that the pawn at KKt5 could be won at any time, so he did not play $B \times P$, though this was the one move that would have made it difficult for Black to set up direct threats. Now Black exploits the existence of this very pawn, and develops vehement pressure.

Position after White's 31st move

$31 \ldots$

## B-K5!

Now already it would be dangerous to take the pawn!
$32 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3 \quad$ B-Kt2

33 R-R2
White hopes that the blocked pawn
will securely cover his King. The ensuing exchange eliminates the block, and White loses at once.

| $33 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $34 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$ |

36 R-B1
To render the great diagonal harmless by 37 B-B3, but . . .

| $36 \ldots$ | P-KKt4! |
| :--- | :--- |
| 37 R-Kt4 | Q-R3 |
| 38 B-B3 | Q-R6!! |

Just at the right moment! The White Rook has got lost in the pawn "forest."

| 39 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 40 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| $41 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{R}(4)-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

$40 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}$
R(4)-B3

## NINETEEN FORTY-FIVE

In the spring of this year the 14th Championship of the Soviet Union was held, at Moscow. This time Smyslov was not particularly successful, and my chief rival was Boleslavsky. In the middle of the tournament I succeeded in defeating him (Game No. 91, infra) and this was the decisive factor in the struggle.

In September a match was played by wireless between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. Unfortunately the technical and organizational aspects of wireless matches are still so far from perfect (forty moves require not five, but eleven to twelve hours' play) that such contests are hardly likely to replace play over the one board or to satisfy the chess master to any extent. Both my games with Denker (Nos. 93 and 94, infra) were, however, played at such a speed that they closely approached normal conditions. Our first game was particularly successful from my viewpoint: it was noteworthy that even the most experienced masters commenting on the play in both New York and Moscow estimated the position down to the 14th-16th moves as in White's favour!

The wireless match ended in the complete defeat of the American team.

## U.S.S.R. CHAMPIONSHIP

June
No. 89. French Defence

|  | A. Tolush | M. Botvinnik |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | (White) | (Black) |
| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

If $7 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ is not played, then probably $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ at once is more exact.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
7 \ldots & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4 \\
8 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2
\end{array}
$$

A serious decision. To avoid a possible exchange of Queens after 8 Q-Q2, White places the Bishop in an obviously disadvantageous position. In this variation the Queen's Bishop is best placed on the QR3KB8 diagonal; later White will have to spend two tempi transferring the Bishop to QR3.

```
... P-B5
9 P-QR4
```

Although this pawn may now be lost, the move is necessary in order to secure QR3 for the Q's Bishop; otherwise $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$ would follow.

## 9 ... <br> Kt-Q2 <br> 10 B-K2

White's opening plan is too slow: $10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ is more energetic, and if 10 ..., P-QR3 then Kt-R3-B4-R5. $10 \ldots$

## Kt-QKt3

In the Smyslov-Botvinnik game (No. 86, supra) the RP was captured by $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 2 \times \mathrm{RP}$. The manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-$ Q2-Kt $3 \times$ RP has the advantage that at R5 the Knight is well placed.
11 O-O
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{P}$
12 Kt -R4

An unfortunate sally. As the result of the exchange of Knights Black's RP is transferred to Kt3, and the break-through P-B4-B5 becomes practically impossible. So for some time White can attack only with pieces, a sure sign that he has not found a sound plan in this variation of the French Defence.

| $12 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{KB} 1$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ ! |

Despite White's unenterprising play, it would be wrong to presume that Black's task is simple. White already intended to transfer his Bishop to the effective diagonal, by means of $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ and $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 1-\mathrm{R} 3$.
The position is closed to such an extent that it is extremely difficult for Black to exploit his material superiority. Difficult, but possible! Now he is preparing a pawn advance on the $\mathbf{Q}$ side, so the white Rook at K1 will be forced to take up a passive position.

| 16 Q-B3 | QR-Kt1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17 KR-Kt1 | Q-B2 |
| 18 B-B1! |  |

After all White succeeds in transferring the Bishop to R3, preventing the advance of the QKtP and so averting immediate catastrophe.
18 .
P-R4
19 B-R3
R-Kt3!

The winning plan is now clear. Black sacrifices the Rook for White's Queen's Bishop, in the final account getting two pawns in exchange for the loss. Without his good Bishop White cannot prevent the exploitation of Black's pawn superiority on the $\mathbf{Q}$ side.

Position after Black's 19th move


White assists in the execution of Black's plan, but to be fair we must remark that otherwise, with $21 \ldots$, Q-Kt1 and the threat of P-Kt5 Black would in any case have forced B-Q6.

| 21 | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| 23 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

After White's 23rd a fine variation is possible: $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $24 \mathrm{Q}-$ K5, Q-B3; $25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 26$ $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K t}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$; $27 \mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $28 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$, and Black queens his pawn. However, White could easily avoid this variation.

| 24 | R-K1 |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad$ Q-ی5

With this manœuvre Black parries the transfer of the White Rook to B3 and, in addition, prepares to advance $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt5}$, which, in conjunction with the attack on the QP, becomes decisive.

| 27 | R-K3 | R-B5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | B-K2 | Q-R5 |
| 29 | B-B3 | P-QKt5! |

Both 30 Q-R2, Q-B3; $31 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ and 30 $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; \quad 31 \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 1, \quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$; $32 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P} ; 33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$;
are bleak prospects. In the latter case Black would quickly get two united passed pawns. Though beautiful, $30 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, $K \times P$ is also bad.

Position after Black's 29th move

$30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$
$31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$
Hoping for $31 \ldots, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R P} ; 32$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Ktl}$. Even so $31 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$; $33 \mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, as pointed out in the preceding note, is rather better.

| 31 | $\ldots$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{R} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 33 | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathbf{Q K t 1}$ |
| 34 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{R} 4$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |

Preparing Kt-B6.

| $35 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $36 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | Kt-B6 |
| 37 R-QR1 |  |

After 37 R-Kt2, P-B3 and then ..., P-K4 Black wins quickly. Now he captures the QR file.

| 37 | Kt-Kt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 38 | R-Q1 |
| 39 | P-R5 |
| 40 | R-R2 |
| K-Kt2 | P-Kt4 |

Here the game was adjourned. White cannot defend the QBP. He sealed $41 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$, but then resigned without resuming play.

The game was awarded the share of the 2 nd-3rd prizes for the best games in the tournament.

No. 90. Sicilian Defence

| Romanovsky | Botvinnik |
| :---: | :---: |
| (White) | (Black) |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |  |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |
| $4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |
| $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ |  |

$6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
P-Q3
This system, including Castling on the Q side, was worked out by the Soviet master, Rauzer.*

## 6 ... P-K3 <br> B-Kt5

Romanovsky rejects $7 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ followed by $8 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$. But if White Castles short there is little point in 6 B-K15. Nor can the text move give White any advantage. In general it can be said that $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} t 5$ in the Sicilian Defence is of benefit only in exceptional cases, as it leads either to simplifications favourable to Black, or to a loss of tempo.

| $7 \ldots$ | B-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 O-O | B-K2 |
| 9 K-R1 | P-KR3 |

$9 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ at once is simpler and better. But as White's Bishop is placed unfortunately at QKt5, $9 \ldots$. ., P-R3 has not spoilt anything yet.

## 10 B-K3

P-R3

Now this is simply feeble! The right move is $10 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, and if $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, then $11 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; 12 $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} ; 13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ! and Black's game is even to be preferred. Now the ordinary Scheveningen Variation is obtained, with the only difference that Black's position has been weakened by P KR3 and the attack $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ may be quite dangerous.

## $11 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ <br> P-K4

Making an attempt to change over to the Boleslavsky Variation (1 P K4, P-QB4; $2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$, Kt-QB3; $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 4 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; $6 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ ) but in the text position this is of doubtful expediency.

```
12 Kt-Kt3 O-O
1 3 ~ K t - Q 5
```

13 P-B4, as in the BotvinnikBoleslavsky game (Sverdlovsk, 1943) is more dangerous for Black. Now Black could reply $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$, for after 14 B-Kt6, Q-B1; 15 P$\mathrm{KB} 3, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 16 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}$ White achieves nothing. The continuation Black chooses leads to a difficult position for him.
$13 \ldots$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$
$14 \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Kt-R4
$15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ !

Black's Knight is pressed back to Kt 2 , where its activity will be at the minimum.

| $15 \ldots$ | P-QKt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16 P-QKt4 | Kt-Kt2 |
| 17 P-QB4 | P-B4 |
| 18 P-B3 |  |

Position after White's 18th move


The critical point of the game: White passes the initiative to Black. $18 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}$;
$20 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ looks more energetic, and then Black's position is far from happy because of the unfortunate position of his Knight at Kt2 and the potential $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$.

Now Black offers an exchange of Bishops, in order to get rid of the most unpleasant of White's minor pieces, his Queen's Bishop.
18 ...
B-Kt4
19 Q-Kt3

The exchange of Bishops is unavoidable. If $19 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt1}$, Black easily deals with the threat $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 5$, as he would control his QB8 square.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
19 \ldots & \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B} \\
20 \underset{\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}}{ } & \mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Kt4}
\end{array}
$$

Weak is $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $21 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, B-Kt4; 22 KR-K1, R-B1; 23 Kt-Kt6, R-QB2; $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ !, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $25 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $26 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, and one cannot see how to make the Knight at Kt2 more active.
Of course it was difficult to foresee all the consequences of $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$, but Black assumed that in the ensuing complications the opportunity would arise of exploiting the defenceless state of White's Bishop and Knight. White in turn was quite prepared for these complications, as the exchange of Queens would lead to an approximately equal endgame.

$$
21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{KP} \times \mathrm{P}
$$

Necessary. Otherwise, after 21 $\ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2 ; 22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$; $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ White has decisive superiority.

## 22 Q-Kt6!!

An interesting move. However, Black finds a saving manœuvre, based on the defenceless state of White's minor pieces.
22 ...
QR-Kt1!
23 Q $\times$ RP

Black's position would seem to be
hopeless, as White has considerable superiority on the Q side, but . . .
$23 \ldots$
Q-K2!!
. unexpectedly the White Queen is in a critical situation. For the moment White has to defend the Bishop at K2.
24 QR-K1
Position after White's 24th move


Evidently, until the last moment White had no inkling of Black's design. The commentators condemned Romanovsky for this move, and probably without justification. Of course, White could save his Queen by 24 KR-K1, Q-K6; 25 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 7$; $26 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 3$ (the variation $26 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 1$; $27 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, R-R2; $28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 5$; $29 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} ; \quad 30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch; 31 $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $32 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Q}$ is rather in Black's favour) but after 26 ..., KR-K1; 27 Q-KB3, Black has a choice between an approximately equal endgame ( $27 \ldots, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ ) and a complicated middle game (27 ..., Q-Kt3; $28 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$; 29 P-QR3, QR-K1).
$24 \ldots$ Q-K6
Now White has to defend a second piece!
$25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 \quad$ R-R1!
An unpleasant surprise! Presumably White was counting only on
$25 \ldots$..., Q-B6, which would not achieve its end because of $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 3$. $26 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$

Black has been rid of his one weakness, the inactive Knight.

White should have continued 27 $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q} ; \quad 28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; $29 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 2$; $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $32 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$; 33 B-Kt3 ch, K-R2; $34 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$, R-Q3; $35 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$, and obviously the outcome would have been a draw. However, the unexpected turn of events threw White off his balance to such an extent that he overlooked one intermediate move.
$27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3 \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$

No. 91. Ruy Lopez

| Botvinnik (White) | Boleslavsky (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| P-K4 | P-K4 |
| $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt-QB3 |
| B-Kt5 | P-QR3 |
| B-R4 | Kt-B3 |
| O-O | P-Q3 |
| P-B3 | B-Q2 |
| P-Q4 | P-KKt3 |

Black avoids the Kecskemét Variation which may follow 7 ..., B-K2. The development of the Bishop at KKt2 has the defect that by exchanging the centre pawns, White may restrict the activity of Black's King's Bishop.

## 8 QKt-Q2 $\quad$ Q-K2

Well played. The KP was already under threat because of $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$. Now Black will succeed in completing his development safely.

| 9 | R-K1 | B-Kt2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Kt-B1 | O-O |
| 11 | B-Kt5 | P-R3 |
| 12 | B-R4 |  |

2 B-R4
It is not easy for Black to defend
$28 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ !
It is pardonable not to notice such a surprise. Now both $29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{R}$; and the text move, are hopeless.

| 29 R-K7 | $\mathbf{P} \times$ B |
| :---: | :---: |
| $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KB} 2$ |
| $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| $32 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | B-Kt4 |
| $33 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| $34 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| $35 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | R-R5 |
| $36 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | K-B3 |
| 37 P-KR4 | P-Kt3 |

To reply to $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 2$ with $38 \ldots$, R-K5!
38 K-Kt1 K-K4

Resigns
himself against the manœuvre Kt -K3-Q5; the inviting $12 \ldots$, P-Kt4 would lead to an irrevocable weakening of his white squares.
$12 \ldots$
Q-K1!
With the idea of winning a pawn by $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QP} ; 14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Ktch} ; 15 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$; and also of transferring the Knight to B5. White should have calmly replied $12 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$, parrying the first threat and taking no notice of the other. The text retreat of the Bishop eases Black's defence.

## 13 B-B2 <br> Kt-KR4 <br> $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$ <br> Kt-K2

$15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ !
This guarantees White a small but undoubted positional superiority. The Bishop at Kt 2 is shut out of play, and the struggle for the open Q file should end in White's favour, as it is easier for him to double his Rooks.
15 ...
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$
16 B-KKt3!

Black has again to look to the defence of his KP; so he is forced
into the following exchange. The attendant transfer of the RP to Kt3 makes it difficult for Black to get active play on the K side.

| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| $18 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1$ |

Boleslavsky's decision to keep control of Q4 lies behind his next move, $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$. It is difficult to recommend anything better for Black. 18 ..., B-Kt4 would be met by $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and if $18 \ldots$, B-K3, then $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$, and the Bishop exchange suits White.

| 19 QR-Q1 | P-QB3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 R-Q2 | Q-K2 |
| 21 KR-Q1 | Kt-Kt3 |

Position after Black's 21st move


Black evidently had no suspicion of the gathering danger. The text move entails an advance of the pawns on the Q side, and White's advantage becomes decisive. Black should have played 21 . .., P-QKt4; though, truly, after 22 P-QKt4 followed by B-Kt3 and Kt-K1-Q3B5 White would still have the advantage.

## 22 P-QKt4! <br> B-K3

Bad is $22 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ because of $23 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 24 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $25 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}$ and White develops a strong attack.

23 B-Kt3
$\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
Alas! Black cannot contest the open file, as his King's Bishop must guard the KP.

| $24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $26 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5!$ |  |

This leads to White's invasion of the seventh rank and capture of a pawn.

## 27 ... Kt-B1

The continuation $27 \ldots$, R-Q1; $28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $29 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $30 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is hopeless for Black.
28 Q-Q7 $\mathbf{Q} \times$ P
If Black had played $28 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, White had a choice between the continuation $29 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $30 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$, followed by capture of the KP, and the variation: $29 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $30 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$, Kt-K2; $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; 32 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2} ; 33$ $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, also with adequate superiority.

Position after Black's 28th move

$29 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP} \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
This is still better. $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$
is bad because of $30 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 6$, and $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$.

| 30 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{RP}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| 32 | $\mathbf{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

K-B1
Black is defending himself dourly, but of course it is too late to save the game.
34 Q-Q6 $\quad \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$
$35 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4!$

This should have led to a quick win.
$35 \ldots \quad$ R-R1

White could have settled the issue at once with $36 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KP}$, and if $36 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{KP}$, then $37 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 6$, $\mathrm{Q}-$ B4; 38 Kt -Q7 ch. After White's inexact move the struggle is prolonged a little.

| $36 \ldots$ | Q-Kt6! |
| :--- | :---: |
| 37 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $38 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$ | is |
| $38 \ldots$ |  |
| 39 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ ch |

It is interesting to note that the apparently strong $39 \mathrm{Kt-K5}$, after 39 ..., Kt-B3!!; 40 R-Q8 (40 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R} ; 41 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R}-$ R8 ch; $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch} ; 43$ K-R3, Kt $\times$ BP ch; 44 K-R2, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8$ mate), $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $41 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$, Q-Kt8 ch; $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P} ; 43$ Q-B7, Q-Q4 leads only to a draw. This interesting analysis was made by G. Ravinsky.

| No. 92. Queen's Gambit Declined |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lilienthal (White) | Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-QB3 |
| 4 Kt -B3 | Kt-B3 |
| $5 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

In previous games against me Lilienthal had played $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ or $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ in this position. This time he chose opening play in the style of the Carlsbad Variation.

Position after White's 39th move


If $41 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ the best reply is 42 P-K5.
42 K-R2 R-KB1
43 Q $\times$ BP!
Decides at once, as the passed pawn inevitably advances. The point of the situation is that after $43 \ldots$, Q-Kt7!; 44 Q-Q6!!, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$; 45 P-B6, K-Kt2; $46 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch!! Black is left without his Rook.

| $43 \ldots$ | K-Kt2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44 Q-Q6 | Q-Kt8 |
| 45 Q-Q4 ch | K-R2 |
| 46 P-B6 | Resigns |

$46 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ is followed by at least $47 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch.

| 5 | KP $\times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 B-Kt5 | P-KR3 |
| 7 B $\times \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |

A serious, and surely unjustified decision. If White did not want to withdraw the Bishop to R4, 7 B-B4 is quite acceptable. Now Black with his two good Bishops can face the future with confidence.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
7 \ldots & \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} \\
8 \text { Q-Kt3 } & \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 3!
\end{array}
$$

After this it is clear that White has no advantage whatever. His

## NINETEEN FORTY-FIVE

only chance of active play is $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, but then $9 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, Q-K2; $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, and the White King cannot retreat because of $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch}$; he would have to resort to the Knight to protect against the check, and in that case White's position would be inferior.
9 P-K3
QKt-Q2
10 B-Q3
Q-K2

Necessary. The Knight must be transferred to B3 to control K5, while the Queen will guard the KtP, after which it will be possible to develop the Queen's Bishop.

| $11 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $12 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |

Position after Black's 12th move


It was not easy to find the best plan here. As a rule, in such positions it is disadvantageous to allow White's Knight to be established at K 5 , and so $12 \ldots, \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ or $12 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ seems more natural. But if 12 . . ., O-O; 13 P-KR3! White has not bad attacking prospects, while after $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 ; 13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5} ; 15 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ White has outstripped Black in development.
13 Q-B2
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$

An inviting, but completely un-
sound plan. At K5 the Knight will be out of touch with the course of the game. To be fair we must observe that it was difficult to foresee that!

$$
14 \ldots \quad \text { K-Kt1 }
$$

$15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$
'If you go a mile, you must go two." But what in general is White to do? $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, recommended by Lisitsin ("14th Soviet Chess Championship", special issue No. 7) with the object of preventing $15 \ldots, \mathrm{P}_{-}$ QB4, is based on a miscalculation, as after $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, Kt-Kt5; 17 P-B4, Kt $\times$ RP White is a pawn down.

## 15 ... <br> P-B4

It is just because of the Knight's position at K 5 that this move is so strong: $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ is met by $16 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 17 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2 ; 18 \mathrm{Kt}-$ $\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$. White cannot establish the Knight at Q4, e.g. $16 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, P-B5!; 17 Q-R4, P-R3; $18 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$.
16 K-Kt1 P-B5
17 B-B5

7 B-B5
Many masters condemned this move, and recommended $17 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ instead. I think that is even worse, for after 17 B-K2, P-KKt3!; 18 P-KKt4, P-KR4; 19 P-KR3, P $\times$ P; $20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7$ White has a very difficult game.

| $17 \ldots$ | B $\times$ B |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 Q $\times$ B | B-Kt5 |
| 19 Q-B2 | R-Q3 |

Not $19 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, because of $20 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}!, \quad \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $21 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, KR-Q1 (21 ..., Q-K3; 22 P-B5); 22 R-K2, P-B3; 23 P-QR3.
20 R-K2 $\quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$.
Strategically, Black's game is won as White's K4 is irrevocably weak. White will have to take steps to exchange the "proud" Knight at K5 for its Black opposite. Alas, as will
be seen from what follows, he fails to do this.

## $21 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$

After $21 \quad \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ Black wins by advancing his Q side pawns. Now White comes under attack with pieces, as the result of which the QBP becomes indefensible.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | Kt-K5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | K-R1 | R-R3 |
| 23 | Q-B1 |  |

Position after White's 23rd move


Let us imagine for the moment that Black's KR is at his QKt3. Then Black would win at once with $23 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$; $25 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 2(25 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $26 \mathrm{R}-$ $\mathrm{QB} 1, \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{Kt})-\mathrm{Kt} 6), \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$. So it is clear that Black should transfer the KR to QKt3. This could be achieved most exactly by $23 \ldots$, P-R4 and then $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3-\mathrm{QKt} 3$. The text continuation is also adequate.

| 23 | $\ldots$ | $R-Q 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | R-QB2 | $R(Q 1)-Q 3$ |

$25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$
An "heroic" attempt to exchange off the Black Knight. Defeat also follows $25 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$; $26 \mathrm{R}-$ K1, R-QR6; 27 R(K)-K2, R(Kt)R3 ( $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ); and the Queen's transfer to R4 decides the issue.

| $25 \ldots$ | R-KKt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 26 P-KR3 | P-R4 |
| 27 Kt-K5 |  |

Tantamount to capitulation! 27.

R(Kt3)-QKt3
$28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
Q-R6!
See note to White's 23rd move.
$29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
If $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 30 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$, $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 32 \mathrm{Kt} \times$ $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R} ; 33 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$; 34 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6!; 35 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $36 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{KP}$, and the endgame is completely hopeless for White.

| 29 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ |
| 31 | $\mathrm{R}(1)-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| 34 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7$ |
| 36 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |

37 R-QB1
White resigned without waiting for Black's reply.

WIRELESS MATCH: U.S.S.R. v. U.S.A.
September
No. 93. Queen's Gambit Declined

## 5 B-Kt5

| Denker (White) | Botvinnik (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$ | P-K3 |
| $3 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | P-QB3 |
| 4 Kt -B3 | Kt-KB3 |

This leads to complex and but little investigated play. $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ is quieter.

| 5 | $\ldots$ | $P \times P$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | P-K4 |  |
| 7 | P-K5 |  |
| 8 | B-R4 |  |
|  |  | P-KR43 |
|  |  |  |

$9 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KKtP} \quad \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Alatortsev's System, $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ (Lilienthal-Alatortsev, in the training tournament, Moscow-Leningrad 1939) has not kept its place in tournament practice since the Bela-venietz-Ragozin game (Leningrad, 1939) in which Belavenietz continued $10 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{BP}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$.
$10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$
QKt-Q2
In the game Van ScheltingaGrünfeld, played in Holland, 1940, there was $10 \ldots$, B-K2, which leads to less complicated play.

## $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Questionable. So Zhivtsov played against me in the Moscow Championship, 1943. In a Szabó-Euwe game, at Hastings in 1940/41, 11 QB3 was played, and Euwe regards this as a very strong continuation. In my view Lilienthal's innovation, 11 P-KKt3! (Lilienthal-Botvinnik, and Mikenas-Botvinnik, Moscow, 1944), sets Black the most difficult tasks.

| $11 \ldots$ | B-QKt2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 B-K2 | Q-Kt3 |
| 13 O-O |  |

13 O-O
In his game against me Zhivtsov Castled long, but then Black managed to develop a strong attack on the King. Evidently Denker thought his King would be safer on the K side; however, the open KKt and KR files also provide Black with good prospects for an attack.
13 ...
O-O-O
14 P-QR4
Shrewd, but, evidently, insufficient to overcome the difficulties that have arisen. White tries to open up play on the Q side, and in passing "invites" Black to win the Queen. After $14 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !, $R \times Q ; 16 \mathrm{QR} \times \mathrm{R}$, White's position is in all probability to be preferred, because of the threat $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$.
$14 \ldots \quad$ P-Kt5!
From this point Black seizes the initiative and holds on to it. As $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ or $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktl}$ would be too passive, White is forced to play $15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$, providing Black with an important tempo for bringing the Bishop at Kt2 into action.
$15 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$
P-B4
16 Q-Kt1!

Not an obvious move. Many masters would automatically play 16 Q-B2, to which Black, however, would reply $16 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6!!; 17$ $K t \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ (there is no other defence against $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{Q P}$; if, for instance, 17 $\mathrm{QP} \times \mathrm{P}$, then $17 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} ; 18$ $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, followed by $19 \ldots$, Q-B2, and the mate is unavoidable!), Q-B2!; $18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{BP} \times \mathrm{P} ; 19 \mathrm{P}-$ QB4, Kt-B4, and Black would get a completely won game.
$16 \ldots$
Q-B2
If White protects himself from the mate by $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ or $17 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ then $17 \ldots, B-K R 3$ would lead to the exchange of the Bishop at Kt 5 and an irresistible attack along the KR file. -The text reply, as is evident from the course of the game, forcedly leads to material losses.

## $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

In order to draw off the Bishop from command of KB3.
$18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P} \quad$ Q-B3
Forcing the opening of Black's QR2-KKt8 diagonal, which in conjunction with the open $K R$ file is of decisive importance.

## 19 P-B3 P-Q6!!

A threat of $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch} ; 21$ $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1 ; \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $22 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1$ ch; and also the simple $20 \ldots$, Q-B4 ch, capturing the Queen's Bishop. After 20 B-K3, B-B4; 21 $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}(21 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 ; 22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4), \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch; $22 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$

Position after Black's 19th move

ch ; or $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $21 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathrm{KKt} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $22 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$, Black's superiority is decisive.
20 Q-B1
B-B4 ch
21 K-R1
Q-Q3!

Only thus. If $21 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $22 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1 \mathrm{ch}$, White has a

## No. 94. Slav Defence

|  | Botvinnik <br> (White) | Denker <br> (Black) |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ | Kt 4 KB 3 |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |

The exchange variation of the Slav Defence guarantees White a minute but indubitable superiority, as in symmetrical half-open play the advantage of the move may tell.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |

It is usual to play $6 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$; Lasker preferred the modest, but reliable, continuation $6 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$. With the text move Black tries to seize the initiative. In the position obtaining this was hardly a sound decision.
7 P-K3
Kt-K5
8 Q-Kt3
P-K3
defence: 23 B-R6. Now this would be met by P-Q7! and White is defenceless.

## 22 Q-B4

Defeat follows $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ also; e.g. $22 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $23 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{R}-$ R1 ch; $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} \mathrm{ch} ; 25$ K-Kt3, P-K4; 26 B-K3 (or 26 BKt5, P-K5 dis. ch; $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt4}, \mathrm{P}-$ Q7!; $28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Pch} ; 29 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} ; 30 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ and wins), $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ dis. ch; $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ (if $27 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$, then $27 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 7 ; 28 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ), $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP}(6) ; 28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch.

| $22 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $23 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $24 \mathrm{Q}-\mathbf{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| $25 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
|  |  |
| Resigns |  |

A short, but tense struggle!
9 B-Q3
B-Kt5
10 QR-B1

In one game of the Euwe-Keres match, 1940, the continuation was $10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $11 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, after which, at the cost of the KP Black had counter-play. 10 QR-B1 sets Black more difficult tasks.
$10 \ldots \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Equal to admission that the attack on QB6 has not achieved its object. $10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ with the potential threats $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ leads to more complicated play, though probably in this case also his good development guarantees White the better game.

## $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ <br> B-R6

Black should have chosen to withdraw the Bishop to K2, as at R6 it will need continual protection.
12 QR-Kt1 P-QKt3
An alluring but erroneous plan. Black should still have played $12 \ldots$,
B-K2 followed by $13 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$.

Position after Black's 12th move


Instead, he weakens his Q side and, in addition, cuts off the Queen's last line of retreat. Probably he hoped to play $13 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$ with exchange of Bishops, but White easily parries this.

## 13 P-K4 <br> $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

Black now sees that $13 \ldots, B-R 3$ leads to loss of a pawn through $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B} ; 15 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $16 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$, but he has not discerned White's basic idea. However it is doubtful whether he could defend himself successfully, owing to the exceptionally unfortunate position of his Queen.

## 14 B-Kt5!

An unexpected stroke. Black cannot avoid losses of material; his Queen is finally "stalemated," and the White manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2-\mathrm{B} 4$ acquires terrible force.

Naturally, after 14 B $\times$ P, B-Kt2, Black, with $15 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ would have a more or less satisfactory game.
$14 \ldots \quad$ B-Q2

Black's attempt to sacrifice his Queen is ingenious, but even this does not save the game.

| $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $17 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |
| 18 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ |

The simplest. It is doubtful whether $18 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{B} ; 19 \mathbf{R} \times$ $\mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ is any stronger.
$18 \ldots$
P-K6!

In this way Black prolongs the game for some ten moves. $18 \ldots$, B-Q4; $19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$ loses at once, because of $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$.

| $19 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{K P}$ | $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c h}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$ | $\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{B}$ |
| $21 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathbf{Q} 2$ |

Hoping for the continuation 22 O-O, KR-QKt1; 23 Q-R5, R-Kt4.

| 22 Q-Kt3 | QR-QKt1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 Q-B2 | R-Kt4 |
| 24 O-O | R-KR4 |

Black's initiative is casual, for as soon as the White Rook comes into action Black will be in a hopeless situation.

## 25 P-KR3 R-QKt1 26 P-QB4 P-Kt3

Freeing the Rook from the necessity to defend the RP, but weakening the Black squares, which White immediately exploits.
27 Kt-Kt4 R-KB4
$28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$
Exchanging off one of the Bishops and opening up the Q file facilitates White's task.
$28 \ldots$
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$29 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{K P}$

An oversight, which does not make any essential difference. The only reply is $29 \ldots$, K-K1! Evidently Black reckoned only on 30 R-Q1 ch, K-K1; but White chooses a more exact order of moves.
30 Q-Q2 ch! Resigns
The Black King cannot retreat to the eighth rank, for then 31 Q-Q6 decides at once; and if $30 \ldots$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ or $30 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ follows, and there is no defence against 32 Q-Q6.

## NINETEEN FORTY-SIX

The first important international tournament of the post-war years was held in 1946, at Groningen in Holland; the U.S.S.R. was represented by five Soviet Grand Masters.

For two-thirds of the tournament I played well, and gathered $11 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of a possible thirteen. The critical game came in the tenth round, when I met M. Euwe (Game No. 98, infra). The two thousand Dutch chess-players watching the game, and all who participated in the tournament were confident that the end-game would go in Euwe's favour. But by "chance" I managed to draw, to the astonishment of the spectators, the other members of the tournament, and my opponent!
However, then I lost my grip, and in the last six rounds I collected only three points. Euwe himself was in no better case, for in the finish he collected only $2 \frac{1}{2}$ points out of five; I was half a point in front of him.
After losing two games in succession (in the 14th and 15 th rounds) I was a whole point behind Euwe. At this jucture Smyslov gave me great moral support. As he and I were setting out to take part in the next round he expressed the view that I had simply got to win the tournament. When I told him I had already lost all hope, he warned me that if I didn't he would take first place himself, though at this stage he was two points behind the leading player. After such an optimistic declaration my spirits rose perceptibly, and I won three games in succession!

Whereas the wireless match with the U.S.A. had demonstrated the strength of the Soviet masters as a group, the Groningen tournament, in which Smyslov brilliantly carried off third prize, proved that the Soviet players had every right to win the world championship.

## GRONINGEN INTERNATIONAL TOURNAMENT

August

No. 95. Grünfeld Defence

| Botvinnik | Smyslov <br> (White) |
| :---: | :---: |
| (Black) |  |


| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

With this exchange Black relinquishes the centre to White; this signifies that Black has "something up his sleeve," and this "something" should open up clear prospects for counter-play. Smyslov did in fact have in mind a certain system of development which (in 1946!) proved
inadequate to get Black equality. A year later he brilliantly succeeded in proving the soundness of his system.

| $6 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |

This is the key move of Smyslov's system. If White avoids the exchange at KB3 and plays $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5,8 \ldots$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ is possible, and $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ is doubtful as it leaves the Knight hanging. After the exchange at KB3 Black has solved the problem of developing his Queen's Bishop, and as soon as the Queen's Knight comes into play all his minor pieces will be developed. Moreover White's pawn centre proves by no means so powerful as it seems at first glance.

Position after Black's 7th move


## 8 B-K3

Kt-B3
Alas! In 1946 Smyslov had not yet found the subtle manœuvre $8 \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ ! Now Black finds himself in a difficult situation.

## 9 P-Q5

White must play very carefully, as Black has already mobilized his forces. For instance, the continuation $9 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 3, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$; $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ ! leads to Black being very active in the centre, so White must not lose any time.

$$
9 \ldots
$$

## $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ !

During the game I thought Smyslov was on an unsound road and that this exchange was not yet forced. I was rather afraid of the manœuvre $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$, with the continuation $10 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$; 11 $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 12 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{BP}$; $13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$, and, despite White's extra piece, it would be difficult to say who had the better position, as White's pawn chain is shattered, while Black's two (extra) central pawns are unassailable. But in reality, after $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$; 10 Q-R4. P-B3; White has the energetic reply 11 R Q1!! and Black is left with a bad game because of his Knight's unfortunate position at R4.

## $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$

The subtlety of Black's idea is that
to $10 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ he replies $10 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-$ QKt4!! and White is forced to part with his central KP; and then Black has fully equal play. However, White safely negotiates this "submarine reef," retaining positional superiority.

| $10 \ldots$ | Kt-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 Q-K2 | P-B3 |
| 12 | P-KB4 |

Position after Black's 12th move


13 B-Kt2!
Now it is clear that Black's opening plan associated with $8 \ldots$... $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ was mistaken; $13 \ldots$... $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ is followed by $14 \mathrm{P}-\underset{\mathrm{K}}{5}!$, Kt-K1; $15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, and Black's QKtP is hopelessly weak. White, retaining the central QP , is able to complete the mobilization of his forces.

| $13 \ldots$ | Kt-Kt3 |
| :--- | :---: |
| $14 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| Still not | $\ldots$, |
| $15 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$. |  |
| $15 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{P}$, because of |  |
| $16 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |
| A useful regrouping of the Rooks. |  |
| $16 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| $17 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |

A sound decision, as otherwise Black has no room for activity and must look on while White strengthens his position. The move leads through a series of exchanges to the endgame,
and though this is unfavourable to Black it is perhaps his only hope of salvation.

At this point, on calculating the exchange variation which follows in the text, I came to the conclusion that it leads to a won endgame with White a pawn up; I did not check this variation further, after each of Black's moves (an unforgivable negligence) but swiftly played the moves I had worked out.
$18 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{Q}$
$19 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}$
$20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$

As the reader will see from the following note, this move surrenders much of White's advantage. The sound move is $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5$ at once, and if $20 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB4}$, then $21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ (followed by $22 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ and 23 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ), giving White to all intents and purposes an extra pawn with the better position.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
20 \ldots & \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} \\
21 \underset{\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5}{ }
\end{array}
$$

Position after White's 21st move


I had closely analysed this position at my 18th move, and had the impression that it is highly favourable to White, as (1) the Bishop at Kt2 is inactive (21 ..., B-R3; 22 P-KR3!); (2) Black must use two tempi to bring his Knight into play (Kt-R3B4); and (3) Black's QBP cannot be
defended, for $21 \ldots, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is met by 22 B-R3 (..., P-R4; 23 P-B3) and Black loses it without improving the position of his pieces.
But now, while waiting for Smyslov to reply, to my chagrin I noticed that after $21 \ldots$, QR-B1; 22 B-R3, P-R4; 23 P-B3, Black continues $23 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$ !! retaining material equality. So if White wants to capture the QBP he must go in for an exchange of Rooks; but after 21 ..., QR-QB1; $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $23 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, Black is left with the Q file for ccunter-play. Evidently, if Black plays $21 \ldots, \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{B} 1$ White must transpose to the rather better endgame: $22 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$; $23 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6$; $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$; $25 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 7$.

However, Smyslov was so demoralized by the speed with which I made the moves through all these exchanges that be did not bother to check his opponent's calculations, and reconciled himself to the loss of the QBP.

| $21 \ldots$ | Kt-R3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ ch |
| $23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathbf{R}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ |
| $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5!$ |  |

Of course White uses every device to maintain his Bishop at B6, as by doing so the Black Rook remains out of play.

| $24 \ldots$ | B-B1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25 R-QB1 | Kt-B4 |
| 26 R-QB4! |  |

In an endgame with Bishops of opposite colours, and pawn weakness on both sides, it is not desirable to chase after great material superiority. E.g. $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ ( $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is met by 27 ..., Kt-Q5! with a double attack, on the Bishop and on the Rook), $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; leads to increased activity of Black's pieces. In any case the

QKtP will not "run away," as 26 ..., $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ ! is sufficiently hopeless for Black.

| $26 \ldots$ | P-K3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $27 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | R-Kt1 |
| $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | R-Q1 |

Smyslov exploits the very first opportunity for counter-play!

| 29 B-K4 | Kt-R5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 K-B1 | B-R3! |

White also has weaknesses, but apart from that he also has two linked passed pawns, which should decide the game.

| 31 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 7!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $32 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 34 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| 35 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 36 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$ |
| 37 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| 38 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} 4$ |

$38 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ is simpler, thus always having the possibility of transferring the Knight to Q3, to defend the $K$ and KB pawns; Black is impotent to prevent the queening of the QRP. But now some small complications follow.

| $38 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 39 P-Kt5 | Kt $\times$ P ch |
| 40 K-Q4 | B-B5 |

Here the game was adjourned. White had to seal his 41 st move. The straightforward advance of his KtP makes a win difficult because of 41 P-Kt6, Kt-Kt5; 42 P-Kt7,

## No. 96. Dutch Defence

| $\quad$Steiner | Botvinnik |
| :--- | :--- |
| (White) | (Black) |

$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; and then $43 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{RP}$. However, White can upset the cooperation of Black's pieces.

Position after Black's 40th move


41 P-KR3! P-B3
After 41 ..., Kt $\times$ P; 42 P-Kt6, and then, if necessary, $43 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$, one of White's two passed pawns reaches the eighth rank betimes. Smyslov tries to improve his King's position.

| $42 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $43 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $44 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |

$45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
$\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}$
$45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
Black is helpless, and further resistance is useless.

| $45 \ldots$ | P-Kt4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 46 P-QR4 | Kt-Q8 |
| 47 P-R5 | Kt-B6 ch |
| 48 K-B6 | Kt $\times$ P |
| 49 K $\times$ Kt | B-Kt1 |
| 50 K-Kt6 | Resigns |

This check is useful only if White does not play $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$. If $5 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, Black's best policy is to withdraw the Bishop, losing a tempo, which in the given position is not so important.
5 B-Q2
B-K2
$6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$

The system associated with the
development of the Knight to KR3 is worth consideration.

| $6 \ldots$ | P-Q4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| 8 O-O | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |
| $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |

Perhaps the Bishop stands best at KB4, but now Black is compensated for the loss of tempo at the 5th move.

$$
9 \ldots
$$

Q-K1
10 Q-B2
An elastic move; now White need not trouble about the QBP, as if $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ he plays $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ with advantage.
$10 \ldots$
Q-R4
11 QR-K1
Steiner is aiming to break through in the centre with P-K4, not a new, but neither is it a very successful plan in this position.
11 ...
QKt-Q2
$12 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$
Consistent, but not good! White plans to continue $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$, but this move, which weakens his control over the central K5 square, hands the initiative to Black and leads to a difficult position for White.

| 12 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | B-B7 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 14 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 15 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5!$ |

## Position after Black's 15th move



It is necessary to prevent P-B4. To $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ Black replies $16 \ldots$, P-KB6, and his superiority would be obvious. It is difficult to say at this juncture that White's game is lost, but after his next, imprudent move, opening the KKt file and weakening the pawn at K5 still further, Black has every chance of victory.

One must remark that all this system for Black ( $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KK} \mathrm{t} 4$, the exchange of minor pieces at K4, followed by P-KB5) is not new. So far as I remember, in a LevenfishModel game (Leningrad, 1930) Model successfully applied it in an analogous position. One has only to add that Levenfish did not exchange at KB4 (which leads to the opening up of the KKt file); he played P-K4, and allowed $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 6$.

## $16 \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{KtP} \times \mathrm{P}$

For White the first unpleasant consequence of the exchange at KB4 is the weak P at K5. The second consequence, which will have its effect only some moves later, is Black's attack along the KKt file, which at the moment seems problematic, but which will be fatal to White!
17 Kt-B3
K-R1

A useful move. White cannot now advance the KP from K3, as after 18 P-K3, R-KKt1; 19 K-R1 (otherwise, $19 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 6$ ) $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ he loses at once.

## 18 K-R1 <br> Kt-Kt2

Both now and later 19 P-K4, $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ e.p. leads to a lost position for White. E.g. $20 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{KP}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$; 21 Q-B2, R-KKt1; 22 Kt-K2, QR3. As White has no other active plan he is forced simply to look on as Black brings up forces for the decisive blow.

[^10]| 20 P-QR3 | R-B2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 21 P-Kt4 | R-KKt1 |
| $22 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{KKt1}$ | Kt-B4 |
| $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ |  |
| $23 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ | only because of |
| $23 . . ., \mathrm{Kt}$ |  |
| 23 | R(B2)-Kt2! |

## Position after Black's 23rd move



It is only seven moves since the KKt file was opened, but Black has already mobilized all his forces except the Queen's Bishop for the attack, and in any case this will not be required. White has practically no move, even $24 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ is impossible because of $24 \ldots, \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ ch. "In

No. 97. Catalan System

| Botvinnik <br> (White) | Vidmar (Black) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | P-Q4 |
| 2 Kt -KB3 | Kt-KB3 |
| $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 4$ | P-K3 |
| $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 3$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| 5 Q-R4 ch | Q-Q2 |

A well-known variation of the Catalan System, in which Black tries to simplify play by exchanging Queens.

$$
6 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{BP} \quad \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

Forcing the Queen exchange, as the Queen's Bishop is undefended.

[^11]his misery" White decides to take the KBP, which psychologically is quite understandable: it may be possible to repulse the attack; and besides, this pawn has continually cramped White's game, and under its cover Black has prepared a decisive blow. However, taking the pawn leads forcedly to defeat.
$24 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$
R-Kt5
25 Q-Q2
Kt-R5

Exchanging off White's chief defensive piece, the Knight at B3. Now the Bishop is under threat: $26 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is out of the question because of $26 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ with inevitable mate. White has one sole defence.
$26 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3$
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$
$27 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$
Also forced; $27 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{K t}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R P}$ ch! leads to mate.

| $27 \underset{\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 1}{ } \quad$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2-K \mathrm{~K} 4$ |  |

Steiner resigned, as after the Queen's retreat Black plays 29 ..., B-B5, and there is no escaping the mate.

## $8 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q} \quad \mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$

Black does not want to let slip the possibility of exchanging Bishops too, but he does not notice that he will get into a difficult situation, for White retains the strong central QP. $8 \ldots$, P-QB4 is the only move.
9 B-Q2
B $\times$ B ch
$10 \mathrm{KKt} \times \mathrm{B}$ !

A sound decision. The Knight is transferred to the Queen side, and the great diagonal opens for the Bishop.

This seems very strong, as at first glance no satisfactory defence
appears against $12 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$. However, White has a simple way of retaining the initiative.

| 12 | K-K2 | B-Q2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | B-Kt2 | B-B3 |
| 14 | P-B3 |  |

After all Black has gained some success. He has developed his minor pieces and compelled White to close the diagonal to the Bishop. But his pieces are cramped in their operations, and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ aids the formation of a pawn centre and the centralization of the White King.

| $14 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 P-QR3 | Kt-Q4 |
| 16 P-K4 | Kt-Kt3 |
| 17 Kt-R5 | B-Kt4 ch |
| 18 K-K3 | O-O-O |

Well played. Black realizes that White's main blow will be directed against the Q side along the half open QB file, and the King is required on that side for defence. Black's immediate anxiety is to relieve himself of the unpleasant Knight at R5 by the manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1-\mathrm{B} 3$.

| $19 \mathrm{KR}-\mathrm{QB} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ |

Vidmar is playing thoughtfully. If he played immediately $20 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3 ; 21 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ !, Kt $\times \mathrm{Kt}$; 22 $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$, and Black would lose a piece.

| 21 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 23 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |

The Black Bishop's manœuvres are interesting. This last move is necessary now, in order to prevent P -QR5-R6 $\times \mathrm{KtP}$, after which the QR file also would be opened and the disunited pawns of the Q side would become a target for attack.
24 P-R5 Kt-R1!
Black is again equal to the situation! If $24 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, then 25 P-R6, P-Kt3; $26 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, K-Kt1;

27 QR-B1, R-QB1; $28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, R-Q1 (otherwise $29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ ); 29 Kt-R3, R-QB1; $30 \mathrm{Kt-Kt5}$, Black loses.

Position after Black's 24th move


25 P-R6
26 P-QKt4

## P-QKt3

After the immediate $26 \ldots, \mathrm{P}$ QB3; $27 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 28 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ is possible. Now White's best continuation is $27 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$, and that he does not do so is perhaps the one criticism that can be made of his play in this game.
27 R-B3
P-QB3
28 QR-B1 P-KB3!

Forestalling the manœuvre $\mathrm{Kt}-$ QB4-K5. Bad would be $28 \ldots$, Kt-B2; 29 P-Kt5, Kt $\times$ P; 30 $\mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7$ ! and White doubles his Rooks on the seventh rank.
Now it seems as though White's initiative has come to an end, Black has succeeded in putting up a defence. Black even offered a draw, but White managed to find an interesting way of renewing the attack.
$29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Ktl}$ !
$29 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$ is also possible, and after $29 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $30 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 3$, B-Q2 (30 ..., P-QKt4; 31 R-QR1! and then $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 1-\mathrm{Q} 2-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ ) this leads to the same position as in the text.
29

0 Kt -R3
What is Black to do? There is a threat of $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 32 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathbf{P}$, $B \times B ; 33 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$, and Black is helpless because of the weakness of the RP. If he plays $30 \ldots$, P-Kt4, there follows $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt1}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 3$, then $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2-\mathrm{Kt3}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and Black's position is lost. If, finally, $30 \ldots$, R-B1, to prevent $31 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, then $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4$, and White breaks into Q6 and obtains clear superiority. So Black is forced to play the Knight to $B 2$, enabling White to organize a break-through along the QB file.

| 30 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}!$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 33 | R-B7 |  |

Position after White's 33rd move


Black's situation is critical. He loses by 33 ..., P-Kt5; $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7}$ ch, K-R1; 35 R(B1)-B7!, B-B1; (after other replies White mates in three moves); $36 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $37 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, and mate in three moves again threatens; just as bad is 33 $\ldots, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$; $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7}, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 35 $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch!, $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $36 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$. The sound course consists in the continuation: $33 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1$, and to 34 $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ not $34 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, because of $35 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad$ B-Kt2; $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, R-B1 (36 ..., B-R3; 37 R(7)-B6!); 37 K-Q2!, R $\times$ R (37 ..., B-R3;

38 R(1)-B6!); $38 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathbf{R}$, B-B1; $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ (the variation $39 \ldots$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $40 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $41 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, K-R2; 42 R-B7 ch, B-Kt2; 43 $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}$, gives White an extra pawn); $40 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4$; $41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $42 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$, and White has a good basis for winning the endgame; but 33 ..., B-B1; $34 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 2!!$; $35 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; $36 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{R}-$ QB1 and Black in all probability can achieve a draw.

Black's text reply enables White, by sacrificing the exchange, to achieve a rare, though not easily exploited, won position.
$33 \ldots$
$34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$
$35 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ !!
$36 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{R} 1)-\mathrm{QB} 1$
There is no other defence against $37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$; $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7} \mathrm{ch}$, K-R1 (38 . ., K-B1; $39 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$, and $40 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 8 \mathrm{ch}$ ); $39 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}$. As the result both Black's Rooks are forced to keep guard along the QB file.

| $37 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | P-R3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch | K-Kt1 |
| $39 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-R1 |
| 40 R-R7 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt} 1$ |
| $41 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | K-R1 |
| $42 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ |  |

With the intention of winning by way of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4-\mathrm{R} 5$, and acquiring passed pawns on the $K$ side. So Black makes a desperate attempt to get rid of the unpleasant Knight.

| $42 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $43 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{R}(8)-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $44 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt1}$ |
| $45 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt7} \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ |
| $46 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt1}$ |

The only move; otherwise 47 R $\mathrm{Kt7}$, and Black is again helpless.
$47 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch
$\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$
48 P-R7ch K-Kt2!

The best reply. The continuation 48 ..., K-R1; 49 P-Q6, R-B1; $50 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ ! ( $50 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $51 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ ! lets the win slip), K-Kt2 (50 ..., R-B8; 51 $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ); $51 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 7, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $52 \mathrm{~K}-$ B4 is still worse. But now White cannot win by the immediate 49 P-Q6, R-B1; 50 K-Q3, R-B8; $51 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QR} 8$ !

| $49 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 50 Kt K 8 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ |
| $51 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $52 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $53 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $54 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| $55 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5!$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $56 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 2$ |
| $57 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $58 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 8$ |

No. 98. Queen's Gambit Accepted

|  | Botvinnik <br> (White) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Euwe <br> (Black) |
| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |

This old continuation, favoured by Rubinstein, is now out of fashion, as it hes been proved that in allowing ..., P-QKt4 White retains the opening advantage without weakening his QKt4. But $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QR} 4$ also leads to difficult play for Black.

| $7 \ldots$ | Kt-B3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 Q-K2 | $B-K 2$ |

A good system of defence adopted in the Semmering-Baden tournament, 1937. Previously it had been customary for Black to exchange in the centre: $8 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 9 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, but in that case White has no
59 K-Kt2
R-R1
60 P-Kt6 Resigns.

60 ..., R-R3; 61 P-Kt7, R$\mathrm{Kt} 3 \mathrm{ch} ; 62 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$, is followed by $63 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}$.

During the first half of the Groningen tournament I played more than one good game, but probably the foregoing was the best of all. The value of this difficult, though perhaps not entirely faultess game was greatly increased by Black's ingenious defence. He can be criticized only for inexact play at the eighth move in the opening, and for his blunder at the 33 rd move in a difficult position, where it was not easy to find the hidden road to the draw.
difficulty in developing his Queen's Bishop.

If $9 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ Black intends to reply: $9 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !
9 R-Q1
Q-B2
$10 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
In one of my games against Keres, at Leningrad in 1941, I continued 10 P-KR3, which at this stage is not obligatory.
10 ...
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$
$11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$
Here a doubtful continuation is $11 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3$ (12 P-K4, $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ !), Kt-K4; $13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{Q} \times$ Kt . If White prepares the exchange at QB5 with 11 P-R3, Black can continue $11 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, and again White does not achieve anything.
11 .
B-Q2
12 B-Kt2 QR-B1

A routine move, which leads to a difficult position for Black. To prevent $13 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ he should have decided on the sharp continuation $12 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 13 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{QR} 4$;
$14 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$, and he would have had serious counter-play on the Q side.

Now the QB file remains closed, and White's superiority in the centre becomes very important.

Position after Black's 12th move


| 13 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5!$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| 15 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |

Essentially the only move, as 15 ..., $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $16 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 5$ ! is unsatisfactory for Black. It is now clear that because of Black's 12th move White has the better of the middlegame. Black has been unable to consolidate his position in the centre, and White's Bishops are very dangerous.

## 16 Q-B4

During the game I had the impression that it would have been stronger to play $16 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 3, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 4$; 17 P-Kt4, B-Kt3; 18 P-R4, P-R3 (18 ..., P-R4; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ ), but it must be admitted that the text move is also not bad.
$16 \ldots$
B-R4
$17 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}$

Quite logical, for the variation 17 P-KKt4, B-Kt3 (doubtful: 17 ..., Kt-R4; 18 Q-KB1!, B-Kt3; 19 QR-B1); 18 P-R4, P-R4 gives Black some counter-play. White surrenders one of his Bishops, but gains still more in space.
$18 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$
Q $\times$ B
Kt-K5 $\quad$ Q-K1!

Euwe is defending himself with great ingenuity. $19 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ is met by $19 \ldots$, B-B3; 20 R-Q5, P-QKt4 (or $20 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $22 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 23 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$; $24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ ) and all is well with Black.

$$
19 \text { R-Q5 R-Q1 }
$$

Position after Black's 19th move


Played with excessive caution, and, as often happens in such cases, Black's position deteriorates as the result. Meanwhile, if he had continued $19 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt4}$ ! (the White Queen must be driven from her excellent position) he would have had a fully equal game; for instance:
(1) $20 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 2, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$, $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{R}$.
(2) 20 Q-B4, R-Q1 (20 . . P R3 is also playable); $21 \mathrm{R} \times$ :
(3) 20 Q-B3, P-B3; 2ı nt-र1, Q-B2!; 22 P-K4, KR-Q1.
After the text move, White would have rich play with 20 P-Kt4, B-Kt3 (20 ..., P-QKt4 is now too late; $21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ !); $21 \mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{Q} 1, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$; $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 1$; $23 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7$ (23 ..., $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1 ; 24 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ !, B-B7; $25 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 3$, $\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{R}$; 26 Q-K5, P-B3; 27 Q-K6 ch). Instead of which, White decides to "play for a mate"; but he lacks "only" one tempo. The initiative
passes to Black, and Euwe begins to play with great energy.
$\begin{array}{ll}20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 7 & \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt} \\ 21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B} & \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1!\end{array}$
If White's QR were at KB1, White would win at once with $22 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{B}$; 23 Q-Kt4 ch, K-R1; 24 Q-B5. Alas, his Rook is at QR1, and in this variation he would himself be mated, so he is forced to lose a highly important tempo!

## 22 R-KB1

P-KKt3!
Very good: White's Rook is shut out of play.

## 23 R-R3 R-Q8

White's pieces have lost their interaction, and Euwe plays for simplification. It must not be forgotten that Black's three pawns to two on the $Q$ side give him tangible superiority in the endgame.

| 24 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KKt} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $25 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch |
| $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 4!$ |  |

Black makes use of a favourable moment to advance the pawn, and White cannot take twice because of the Black Queen's possible check.

| $26 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 27 Q-B4 | $\mathbf{P}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |

Ensuring the King's safety. Now White has to defend the QKtP.

| 28 P-K4 | Q-Q8 ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 K-Kt2 | B-Q3 |

Euwe is deliberately playing for the endgame. Black can hardly achieve more; for instance, if $29 \ldots$, Q-B7; $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 1, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2$ (otherwise $31 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ); $31 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$, White maintains the balance of power.

| 30 | $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 32 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 33 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |  |

Of course, after $33 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch, $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$; $34 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, Black wins by transferring his King to QR4.

Here White perhaps could play more strongly, i.e. $33 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 3, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$; 34 $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; \quad 35 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; 36 K-B1, K-B2! (36 ..., P-B6; $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 1$ ! leads to a draw, as the QBP is lost); $37 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 2, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $38 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5$, and a draw is quite likely.

| 33 | $\ldots$ | R-B1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 34 | K-B3 | K-B2 |
| 35 | K-K3 | K-K3 |

36 P-B4
This part of the game was spoilt a little by a time-scramble: on the other hand, without it this game would not have hadits valuable finish! White's last move is weak, as Black gets the central K4 square for his King. It is possible that this move does not really lose, but the simple $36 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$ suggested itself, and Black, despite his advantage, could hardly force the win.

| $36 \underset{\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}}{ }$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| :--- | :--- |
| $37-\mathrm{B} 5$ |  |

$37 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$
P-B5
$38 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
Otherwise $38 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ follows.

| 38 | P | $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39 | P-R4 | P-R3 |

It may seem strange that this natural move should give White new chances of salvation. After the game Flohr suggested $39 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ as the strongest. But Euwe found a serious objection, namely: $39 \ldots$, R-B4; 40 P-K5!, K-Q4; 41 R-K3!, R-B3 (41 ..., P-B6; 42 P-K6, P-B7; 43 P-K7, R-B1; 44 R-K1, K-Q3; $45 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt5}$, K-Q2; 46 R-QB1, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 6$ ); $42 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$, and White still has hopes of avoiding defeat.
40 P-Kt5! P-R4
White had to seal his move at this critical point. I regarded the game as lost, as I knew that Rubinstein had lost to Lasker, at Petersburg in 1914, in an analogous position. But
when during the adjournment I set up the pieces for the purpose of analysis, I at once saw a hidden possibility of a draw. The game was resumed after a break of an hour and a half.
Position after Black's 40th move

41 K-K3
K-K4
42 R-B2!!
The only move.

| $42 \ldots$ | P-B6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 43 K-Q3 | R-Q1 ch |

Here my opponent was lost in thought; he saw that the game should end in a draw. In the LaskerRubinstein game there were no RPs (the position was identical, except that the colours were changed) and Lasker won by 43 ..., R-B2; 44 K-K3, R-R2; followed by R-R6 ch, and R-KKt6. Rubinstein could not escape this continuation, since the pawn ending was a lost one for him.

But in my game $43 \ldots$..., R-B2 led

## No. 99. French Defence

## Stoltz

(White)
Botvinnik

1 P-K4
2 Q-K2
Master Stoltz avoids the usual variations, and adopts the move of
to a different situation, namely $43 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 44 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ ch; $45 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P} ; 46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$; $47 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Q} 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt5}$; $48 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt5} ; 50 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$; 51 K-B6, P-R6; 52 P-Kt6, P-R7; 53 P-Kt7, P-R8(Q); 54 P-Kt8(Q) ch, and draws!

## 44 K-K3!

After $44 \mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}$ Black retains the possibility of playing for a win, as the White King is cut off from the pawns.

| $44 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $45 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| $46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $47 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6!$ |  |

The last finesse. The variation 47 R-B5 ch, K-Q3; 48 R-R5, R-QB5 also perhaps leads to a draw, but White would have more than one difficult problem to solve.
47 ...
R-B5 ch
Black cannot defend the KtP; e.g. 47 ..., K-B4; 48 R-B5 ch, K-K3; 49 R-B6 ch, and White either gives perpetual check, or he attacks the KtP.

| $48 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| $50 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $51 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |  |
| Drawn. |  |

A fighting game! Without doubt its ending will be given in all future textbooks on the endgame.
the great Russian player, Tchigorin. However, as play proceeds it transpires that Stoltz does not know all the finesses of Tchigorin's opening idea.
2 ...
P-QB4
3 P-KKt3

Here $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ is better, to hinder
the development of the Black Bishop to QKt2.

| $3 \ldots$ | Kt-QB3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 B-Kt2 | KKt-K2 |
| 5 Kt-QB3 | P-KKt3 |
| 6 P-Q3 | B-Kt2 |
| $7 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |  |

This plays into Black's hands, and he provokes the exchange of the central KP and then consolidates his QKt in the centre.

$$
7 \ldots \quad \text { P-Q4! }
$$

$\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ threatens. $8 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}$ would be met by $8 \ldots, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 4$.

| $8 \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $9 \mathbf{Q}-\mathbf{Q} 2$ |  |

After $9 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{B}$; and $10 \ldots$, $K t \times P$ Black has easy play.
$9 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$
10 QKt-K2
The variation $10 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{P}$; $12 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QKt}$, $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $13 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$ is not dangerous for White.
$10 \ldots$ P-B1 P-KR3

White prepares both $12 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$ and the exchange at Q4. The immediate exchange $11 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, would lead, after $11 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $12 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4$, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ to the loss of a piece. The same result follows $11 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QB} 3$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5 ; 13$ $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 14 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$.
$11 \ldots$
B-B4
12 P-QB3
A losing move! White should have played $12 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $13 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{QB} 1$; $14 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 1$, and he still retains his strong position.
12 ...
$\mathbf{K t} \times \mathbf{K t}$
$13 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt} \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$
Not, of course, $13 \ldots, \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{QP}$ because of $14 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{BP}$.

14 B-Q2
$\mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{P}$
$15 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{KtP}$

Position after White's 15th move


Evidently White was counting on 15 ..., R-QKt1; 16 B-B3, O-O; $17 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$, and $18 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 1$ with a possible defence. However, a little surprise awaits him.
$15 \ldots$
$\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ !
It transpires that in the given situation the Bishop is much more important than the Rook. In sum Black wins a decisive tempo for attack.

## 16 B-B3 <br> P-Kt4!

Depriving White's pieces of KB4 square and preparing the Knight's final manœuvre: $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3-\mathrm{K} 4-\mathrm{Q} 6$.

| 17 O-O | Kt-Kt3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 18 R-K1 | Kt-K4 |
| 19 B-Kt2 | B-R3 |
| 20 Q-Q1 | Kt-Q6 |
| 21 Q-R4 | Q-B3 |

White cannot avoid losses of material.

| 22 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KB} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 23 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |
| 24 | $\mathrm{QR}-\mathrm{K} 1$ |
| 25 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| K-B2 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |  |

And a few moves later White resigns.

No. 100. French Defence

|  | Tartakower <br> (White) | Botvinnik <br> (Black) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{KB} 3$ |  |

The plan of play Tartakower has chosen is interesting. In order to exclude any surprises in the opening, he has gone in for the exchange variation (usually this variation is chosen as a convenient base for a draw). But in this game he cleverly finds a way of complicating the struggle.

| 4 | —. | B-Q3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | P-B4 | Kt-KB3 |
| 6 | P-B5 |  |

Hardly the strongest, as Black forces the exchange of this pawn.

| 6 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{K} 2$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{QKt} 3$ |  |
| $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{RP} \times \mathrm{P}$ |  |
| $9 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 3$ | $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ |  |
| $10 \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{O}$ | $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{KKt5}$ |  |

It is not easy for Black to find a sound plan. 10 ..., P-QB4 seems inviting, but it leads to a weakening of the QKt4 square, and after 11 B-KKt5!, B-K3; $12 \mathrm{Kt-K5}$ White has the initiative. White chooses a double-edged continuation.

| 11 | P-KR3 | B-R4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | P-KKt4 | B-Kt3 |
| 13 | Kt-K5 | B $\times$ B |
| 14 | Q $\times$ B | P-B3 |
| 15 | $\mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ |  |

$15 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$
15 B-B4 is more cautious. Now there is a sharp struggle; but it must be remarked that, as the further course of the game shows, White did not foresee Black's reply.
$15 \ldots \quad K t \times P$
An unexpected stroke, which Black

Position after White's 15 th move

decided upon after twenty minutes' consideration. Black gets the clear advantage from $16 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $17 \mathbf{B} \times \mathbf{Q}, \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$; $18 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Kt} \times$ KtP , but difficult play for both sides comes out of $16 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{B}$. E.g. 17 K-Kt2 (17 P-B4, B-B3; 18 K$\mathrm{Kt} 2, \quad \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; \quad 19 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 1, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ), P-B3; 18 R-R1, B-R3; $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$, R-B2 (19 ..., $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ !); $20 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4$, B-Kt4; and despite Black's extra pawn the struggle has only just begun, as White has retained the initiative.

White mistakenly rejected the continuation indicated; he decided to preserve material equality, which hands the initiative to Black. And if the initiative passes to Black the weakness of White's K side begins to tell and his game proves to be lost.

| 16 | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{QBP}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | $\mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{B}$ | $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 18 | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4!$ |

A great unpleasantness for White! He cannot take at KB5 because of $19 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ (or $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ) and Black swiftly transfers his forces for an attack on the King. Nor is there any sound way of defending the KtP. Tartakower chooses the best course: he sacrifices the KtP, in order to gain time to double his Rooks on the $K$ file.

19 QR-K1!
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$

R-B6
An important move, shutting the White Queen out from defence of the King.

## 21 Q-Kt5 <br> Kt-Kt3 !

Fundamentally the game is decided, but . . . the time check plays its part. Naturally, $21 \ldots$ Q-Q3; $22 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$ is inadequate, Black would have to take a draw by $22 \ldots$, R-Kt6 ch. Now, after $22 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q} ; 23 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ and $24 \ldots$, R-KB1 followed by $25 \ldots$, P-Kt6 or $25 \ldots, \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ the endgame is hopeless for White. With his next move White gains equality of material, but he cannot hinder the development of Black's attack.
$21 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$
Q-B3
22 R-Kt5
Tartakower is defending himself with extraordinary tenacity. If at once $23 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{R} 5$, then $23 \ldots$, R-Q1 (preventing check at Q5) and Black should consummate his attack without difficulty. Now the KKtP is threatened, and White has a tempo for checking with his Queen.

| $23 \ldots$ | R-KB1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $24 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | Q-B5 |
| 25 Q-Q5 ch | K-R1 |

At first glance this move serves only as defence against mate (R-R6) but it is associated with a counterthreat (Kt-Kt5). So 26 ..., P-Kt6; $27 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt5}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch; $28 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ is not dangerous for White. Now White was in severe time trouble while Black had fifteen minutes in hand. Black wins most simply by 26 ..., P-R3; 27 Q-K6, R-K6!; $28 \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Kt}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, and there is no defence against $29 \ldots, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{QP}$ or $29 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 7$ (in conjunction with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt}$ ). In this variation I failed to find $27 \ldots$, R-K6, and spent ten precious minutes on my next move,
so I, too, found myself in time trouble and all but let the win slip out of my hands.
$26 \ldots$
R-KR6
$27 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$
$\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}$
$28 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$

Defeat follows at once after 28 Kt-Kt5, Kt-K2!; 29 Q-K5, QKt5 ch; 30 Q-Kt3, $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch; $31 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{ch}$.

| $28 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $29 \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 4$ | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $30 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 1$ | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{Q}$ |
| $31{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Q}$ | R-B5 |
| $32 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1$ | P-R3 |

$32 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$; 33 R-B8 ch, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt2}$; $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Bl}$ is simpler.
33 R-B3 P-KKt4
An inexact move caused by time trouble. The sound move is $33 \ldots$, $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$, eliminating the important passed pawn with a gain of tempo, and then returning the Knight to B6.

| $34 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt5}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $35 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |
| $36 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 3$ |
| $37 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ |
| Probably 37 | $\ldots$ |
| $38 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{R}$ is stronger. | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$ |
| $39 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Q} 6$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| $40 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$ | $\mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $41 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4!$ |

Position after Black's 41st move


The sealed move. It is obviously the most logical. White's misfortune consists in the desperate position of his King, under the mortal threat of P-R5 followed by P-Kt6-Kt7 mate. Even in the difficult variation $42 \mathrm{P}-$ R4!, Kt-Q7!! (pointed out by Bronstein); 43 P-R5, P-R5; 44 P-R6, P-Kt6; 45 P-R7, P-Kt7 ch; $46 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 2$, Kt-B6 ch; $47 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, P-Kt8(Q); 48 P-R8(Q), Q-R7 ch; $49 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, Kt-K4 ch, with speedy mate, White could not save himself.

| $42 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $43 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| $44 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4$ |  |

Shrewder is $44 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, so that if 44 ..., K-Q6; 45 P-Kt5, K-K7; 46 P-Kt6, K $\times$ P; $47 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$; $48 \quad \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6 ; 49 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Kt}$, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $50 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt7}$, K-B7; $51 \mathrm{P}-$ Kt8(Q), P-Kt7 ch; 52 K-R2, P$\mathrm{Kt8}(\mathrm{Q})$ ch; $53 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{RP}$ the Kt 6 square is defended by the Queen, and the win is impossible. However, Black could continue 44 . . . , Kt-Q5! and because of the threat $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 6 \times \mathrm{P}$,

White's situation would remain hopeless.
44 ... K-Q6 $45 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 5$

Further advance of the RP is useless, as Black mates at KR6.

| $45 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 7$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $46 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |
| $47 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |  |

$47 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{Pch}$
Taking the $\mathrm{RP}(4)$ leads step by step to mate: $47 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}(4), \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$; $48 \mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $49 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7$; 50 P-R6, Kt-Kt4; 51 P-R7, Kt-K5; 52 P-R8(Q), Kt-B7 mate.
$47 \ldots \quad$ K-B8
$48 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6$
$49 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 7$
50 P-R5 P-R5
$51 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 4 \quad \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 8$
$52 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 2 \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$
$53 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 3 \mathrm{ch} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 7$
$54 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch} \quad \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 7$
White resigns, as the mate is unavoidable. A struggle that was not without mistakes, but was also full of interest!

## APPENDICES

## SIX STUDIES

So far as the composition of studies is concerned my activities have been of a very modest nature. In more than twenty years I have six studies to my credit. In every case I have taken my themes from actual games.
The mating combination at the basis of the first study was one which I carried out in a friendly game with the Leningrad 1st category player, Liutov, in the winter of 1925 . In the position shown on the diagram, Black has two extra pawns and a strong attack, as against White's extra Knight. The play went: $1 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{KR} 4!$; $2 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{P}$ (a loss follows both $2 \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{KKt4}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$ ch; $3 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{P}$, Q-R8 ch; $4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{K} 8 \mathrm{ch}$; and 2 Q$\mathrm{Kt} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 3$, and there is no defence against $3 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, $\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{R} 8 \mathrm{ch} ; 3$ K-Kt4, Q-Q8 ch; $4 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3, \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{Q} 2$, mate! The end was so unexpected that for a moment my opponent did not notice that the game was over.

BotVInNIK


Liutov Black to play

Together with a composer of studies I worked over this combination, and gave it a more finished form. ${ }^{1}$

The solution is not difficult:

| 1 | P-Kt4 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | B-R6! | $\mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{B}$ |
| 3 | Q-R2 ch | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt4}$ |
| 4 | Q-Q2 ch | $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |
| 5 | Q-Q8 mate |  |



White to play and win

My second study was composed fourteen years later. While working on the book of the U.S.S.R. Eleventh Championship (1939) I analysed the endgame in a Levenfish-Kotov game. I had to spend a long time over one variation; the analysis resulted in the following pawn ending: ${ }^{2}$
${ }^{1}$ This study was published in Shakhmatny Listok (Chess Sheet), No. 11, June, 1925
${ }^{2}$ Shakhmati v S.S.S.R. (Chess in the U.S.S.R.), No. 10, October, 1939.

The study seems simple enough, yet it is very difficult. White can easily capture the QP, but after $1 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$; $2 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$; $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 6, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ !; $4 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Q} 2$; $5 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$; Black saves the pawn at R3, the existence of which makes $6 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 5$ impossible. So White must capture both the RPs, for that is his only chance of winning. Even this is possible, again because of the existence of the pawn at R3. For instance, if the White King can get to QR8, because of the pawn at R3 Black cannot maintain the opposition and both the RPs will be lost.

So we shall try to get the King to R8.

| 1 | $K-B 5!$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $K-B 6!$ |$\quad$ K-Kt3

White takes the opposition.



White to play and win

And White wins.

My next study was entered for the annual competition of Shakhmati v S.S.S.R. (Chess in the U.S.S.R.) 1939, and received the fourth prize.

The position opposite arose in a tournament game. After it was finished a win for Black was pointed out: $1 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 1 ; 2$ R-K5, P-K8(Q) ch; $3 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; 4 K-B4, R-Kt1; 5 P-Kt5, K-B7; 6 K-Kt4, K-Kt7, and White loses. E.g.: $7 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$, K-Kt6; 8 P-Kt6, K-R5; 9 K-B6, K-R4; $10 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 7$, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 3$. It was also pointed out that the variation $1 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch} ; 2$ $\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ leads only to a draw.
So it can be deduced that if the White Rook were not at K8, but, for instance, at


Black to play K7, the game should end in a draw, as after $1 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 2 ; 2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch} ; 3 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{R}$; $4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$, R-Kt2; 5 P-Kt5, K-B7; 6 K-B5, K-Kt6; 7 P-Kt6, K-R5; 8 K-B6 White gains the decisive tempo.
None the less, White should lose irrespective of where his Rook is stationed in the first place.
The solution is quite ingenious:

$$
1 \ldots \quad \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 8(\mathrm{Q}) \mathrm{ch}!
$$

| $2 \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{Q}$ ch | $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{R}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ | $\mathbf{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 7!$ ! |

The winning move. Here the Rook occupies the ideal position, and Black now has only to bring his King into action by the shortest route.

| 4 | P-Kt5 | K-B7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | K-B5 | K-Kt6! |

This is the shortest route-first along the diagonal.

| 6 | P-Kt6 | K-R5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | K-B6 | K-R4 |

And now up the file.
8 P-Kt7
K-R3
And the White pawn is lost.
The Rook manœuvre to Kt7 and the King's subsequent manœuvre (K-B7-Kt6-R5) is not without beauty.

I did not have to compose the fourth study. ${ }^{1}$ It arose automatically during my analysis of the finish of a Boleslavsky-Bondarevsky game (Moscow, 1941).
This position could have arisen in the game I have mentioned. It did not because of a mistake on White's part. White threatens the Knight sacrifice at $\mathrm{Kt7}$ ( $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5$ and $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{P}$ ) followed by $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4-5-6$ and $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 6-7-8(\mathrm{Q})$. Black has only one defence:

$$
1 \ldots \quad \text { B-Q7 }
$$

Now $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}$ ch is premature because of $2 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$. It is impossible to win without the aid of the RP. So at first
White must confine himself to defence.

$$
2 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3
$$

B-B5
We shall consider the other possibility: 2 ..., B-B6, later.

$$
3 \text { P-R4 }
$$

B-Kt6
Of course, $3 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ loses at once because of $4 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$.

$$
4 \text { P-R5 B-B5 }
$$

White would seem to be at a dead end. To 5 P-R6 Black can reply $5 \ldots$. P-Kt3.

$$
5 \text { P-Kt6 ch K-B3 }
$$

If $5 \ldots, K-B 1, K t-R 4-B 5 \times P$. $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 5$ !!

Study No. 4-1941


Black to play; White to win Now Black may as well resign, as after $6 \ldots, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $7 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$, or $6 \ldots$,
${ }^{1}$ Published in Shakhmatnaya Khronika (Chess Chronicle) of the Soviet Society for Cultural Relations, No. 11, November, 1944.


Black to play and win
$\mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{Kt} ; 7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ White queens a pawn. To any waiting move White continues: 7 P-R6, B $\times$ P; $8 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch}$, and $\mathrm{Kt} \times \mathrm{B}$.
To be fair, I must note that there is another way of winning, also brilliant, but more modest, i.e. $6 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 2$ ! with the same irresistible threat of $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$.

Now we shall consider the second possibility: $2 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6$.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
2 \ldots & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 6 \\
3 & \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 4 & \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Kt} 7
\end{array}
$$

No good comes of $3 \ldots, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$. $3 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 3$ is bad because of Kt-R2-Kt4-R6 ch.

## 4 P-R5

B-B6
Here White achieves nothing by 5 P-Kt6 ch, because of $5 \ldots$, K-K3! (of course, not $5 \ldots$ K-B3; 6 P-R6!) followed by K-B4-Kt5. So how should White play?

$$
5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 4 \quad \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{Q} 7
$$

Otherwise $\mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 5 \times \mathrm{P}$ is decisive. Now Black parries $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ with $6 \ldots$, P-Kt3.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 6 \text { P-Kt6 ch } \\
& 7 \text { Kt-B5!! }
\end{aligned}
$$

K-B3

A second surprise, which also decides the issue. After $7 \ldots, K \times K t$; $8 \mathrm{~K} \times$ P, K-Kt4; 9 K-R7! (but not 9 P-R6, K-R4!; 10 P-R7, B-B6 ch; 11 K-B7, K-R3; and draws!), B-B6; 10 P-R6, and a White Queen is inevitable.

In January, 1945, I played an evening session of simultaneous chess at the Ministry of Aviation Industry. I cannot say that I began auspiciously. The first game was finished in fifteen minutes-alas, my opponent took advantage of an obvious blunder and mated. The atmosphere at once grew tense. The chairman of the chess club announced: 1-nil in favour of the Ministry players. Then the account was squared, but after two hours it was 18-1.

The twentieth and last game drew to its close. Naturally, everybody was following it with deep attention. My opponent proved a tough nut to crack, and when the game reached the position shown in the diagram I had to stop and think.

Here White achieves nothing by $1 \mathrm{~K} \times$ P, K-B5; $2 \mathbf{K - K t 5 , ~ K ~} \times$ P; 3 P-Kt4, $\mathbf{P} \times$ P; $4 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{B} 5$; or $1 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt6}, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5 ; 2$. $\mathbf{K} \times \mathrm{RP}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $3 \mathbf{K}-\mathrm{K} t 4, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5$, and both players queen a pawn.

If $1 \mathbf{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$, then $1 \ldots, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P} ; 2 \mathbf{K} \times$ KtP, K-K5!; 3 P-R5, P-B4 ch; 4 K-Kt3, K-K6; 5 P-R6, P-B5 ch; 6 K-Kt2, K-K7,


Botvinnik with the same result.

None the less, White did play $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt4}$. The game continued: $1 \ldots$..., $\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 2 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 3$ (unfortunately, my opponent did not find $2 \ldots$,

K-K5!); 3 P-R5, K-B2; $4 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 5, \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$; $6 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \dot{\mathrm{P}} ; 7 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$. White then captured the $K t P$, and won the game. The onlookers were disappointed.
However, the reader would be wrong in thinking that I played 1 P-Kt4 in the hope that my opponent would make a mistake. I had the following variation in mind: $1 \ldots, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P} ; 2 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{KtP}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 5 ; 3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$; 4 K-R3!!

This paradoxical move holds the solution to the problem. Now $4 \ldots$, P-B5; 5 P-R6, P-B6; 6 P-R7, P-B7; 7 K-Kt2 leads to a win for White. Black lacks one tempo.
After I had arrived home I set up the position again, and discovered that there is one other subtle road to victory: 1 K B4! Now there is no defence against $2 \mathrm{P}-$ $\mathbf{K t 4}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{P}$; after which White does not waste time on taking the KKtP but plays $3 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ at once, and wins, as in the game.

For some time afterwards I was haunted by the thought that I had seen a similar position already somewhere. Reuben Fine's book, Basic Chess Endings, came to my aid. The diagram opposite is of an ending which could have arisen in a Kmoch-Van Scheltinga game, at Amsterdam in 1936, and it closely recalls the one that arose in


Кмосн my game.

Analysing this position, Fine pointed out that with Black to move, after 1 ..., K-B4!; 2 K-B3, K-K4!; 3 K-Kt4, K-K5!; 4 P-R5, P-B4 ch; 5 K-Kt3, K-K6; 6 P-R6, P-B5 ch; 7 K-Kt2, K-K7; 8 P-R7, P-B6 ch the game should end in a draw.

I also looked through other books on the endgame, but did not find any similar positions. Then it occurred to me that perhaps the move K-R3 was a "discovery" in this well-studied sphere of simple pawn endings. I at once composed a small study on the theme-my fifth in order of creation. ${ }^{1}$

| 1 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 2$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{B} 3$ | $\mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{K} 4$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ | $\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch |
| $4 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$ | $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |  |
| 5 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 5$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 \mathrm{ch}$ |
| $6 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{R} 3!!$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 5$ |  |
| $7 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 6$ |  |
| 8 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 7$ | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 7$ |
| $9 \mathrm{~K}-\mathrm{Kt} 2$ |  |  |

And White wins.


White to play and win

[^12]The following study, by A. P. Gulaev, won the first prize in a competition devoted to the U.S.S.R. Sixteenth Championship. One has only to look at it to feel antipathy for it: the position of the White King at QR7 is altogether too unnatural.

It is pretty obvious that the King could have reached this square only by "travelling" along the eighth rank, which seems quite incredible to any practical player. The solution is as follows:

| 1 | $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 7$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ |  |

1 P-K7
R-K5
Study by A. P. Gulaev-1948
If $2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$, then $2 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ! (bad is $2 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 ; 3 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $4 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4$ ch!! and so is $2 \ldots, \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{P}$; $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ ); 3 $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P} \operatorname{ch}, \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$, and in the author's opinion a draw is inevitable. (4 R-B8, B-B2.)

| $2 \ldots$ | $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ | $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{P}$ |

Now bad is $3 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 4 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P} ; 5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$.

| 4 R-B6! | R-K4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 R-B4 ch | B-B5 |
| 6 R $\times$ B ch | K-Kt6 |
| 7 R-B3 ch! |  |



White to play and win

And in ten moves White wins the endgame; Black is lost because of the unfortunate position of his Rook at K4.
Before I studied the solution given I had the impression that the key move was 2 R-B5 ch, and so I began to check Gulaev's observations thoroughly. After several attempts it became clear that in the variation $2 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 5 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{B} 4 ; 3 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}$ ch, $\mathrm{K} \times \mathbf{P}$; White's "quiet" 4 R -B5!! puts Black in a desperate position. He loses both after $4 \ldots, \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 7$; $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ !, $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 8(\mathrm{Q})$; 6 P-K8(Q) ch! and after $4 \ldots, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 3$; $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 6, \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{K} 4$; 6 R-B4 ch, B-B5; $7 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch, and $8 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$.
The study could have been relegated to the archives if Ragozin had not found a shrewd defence for Black, in the move: $4 \ldots$, B-B2!! After $5 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$, K-Kt6!!; 6 B-R6, P-K7; 7 B-Q2, PKt4!; 8 K-Kt6, P-Kt5; 9 K-B5, P$\mathrm{K} 8(\mathrm{Q}) ; 10 \mathrm{~B} \times \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$; or $6 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4, \mathrm{R}-$ $\mathrm{K} 3 ; 7 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{Kt} 4 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 7$ a draw is inevitable. Having worked quite a lot on this position, I proceeded to compose a study which I think completely reveals its latent possibilities and is more in line with the artistic taste of those fond of the "practical" art of chess.

Solution:

| 1 P-K7 | R-K5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 R-B5 ch | K-R5 |
| 3 R-B5!! | P-K7 |

White to play and win


Defeat follows both $3 \ldots$..., R-K3; 4 R-B6, R-K4; 5 R-B4 ch, B-B5; $6 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}$ ch and $7 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 8$; and also $3 \ldots, \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{B} 2$; $4 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{Kt6}$; $5 \mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B} 4$ (or 5 B-R6; P-K7; 6 B-Q2), R-K3; 6 R-Kt4 ch and 7 R-Kt8.

```
4 R-B4
5 P-K8(Q) ch
```

And White wins.

## WHAT IS A "COMBINATION"?

In his book The Middlegame (1st edition), Romanovsky has defined a "combination" in the following words: "A combination is a variation (or group of variations) in the course of which both sides make forced moves and which ends with an objective advantage for the active side."

It is certainly true that this formula contains the definition of a "combination," but it also includes something else. For instance, in the well-known position given in the following diagram, after $1 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{Kt6}, \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$; $2 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R} 6$ White gains material superiority by force. Of course, this is a combination; and that follows also from Romanovsky's definition. But in the following position of Grigoriev's, White saves the game by a fine march on the part of his King: K-Q7-K6-B5-K4-Q3-B2.


This variation, forced for both sides, ends with a definite achievement on White's part, he gets a draw. According to Romanovsky this is a combination. But of course there is no combination here at all: White carries out not a combination, but a manœuvre.

Take a still more striking example: a well-known study by the Czechoslovakian Grand Master, Réti (See next page). White achieves a draw by a brilliant and forced variation. According to Romanovsky this is a combination. In reality there is no combination here either: it is an example
of a brilliant manœuvre. Consequently Romanovsky's definition does not define "combination."

I have deliberately taken simple instances in order not to complicate the question. One could take more complex examples, but fundamentally it makes no difference.


White to play and draw
What distinguishes a combination from a manœuvre? (Naturally, for the moment we leave unforced manœuvres out of consideration; we shall be dealing with them later.) It is sacrifice. The characteristic feature of a combination is sacrifice. From his very first steps the player is taught that a pawn is equal to a pawn, that a Bishop is equal to three pawns, a Rook stronger than a Knight. But in a combination this correlationship is violated. The customary strength of a piece is to some extent modified, and translated into generally accepted language this connotes sacrifice (sound sacrifice, of course, for we are discussing combination). It is interesting to note that the customary correlations of pieces cease to operate sometimes for a whole sequence of moves, and the transition to this new state of affairs is not gradual, but sharp, in one jump. And similarly in any combination there should be a sudden jump back to the normal state of affairs, when a Bishop is again equal to three pawns, a Queen stronger than a Rook, and so on. If a combination consists of a single move these two jumps are fused; in the "old position," with his 2nd move: P-R6, White ignores the recapture of the pawn and, on the contrary, sacrifices a second pawn. The customary quantitative relationships are violated, there is a sacrifice. But with this selfsame move 2 P-R6 the normal picture is restored, for White forcedly obtains a new Queen, and a Queen is worth more than three pawns. So the two jumps are fused in one move.
We have digressed a little. Then what is a combination? A combination is a forced variation with sacrifice. It seems to me that this is both an exact and a simple definition. A combination must not be confused with a forced manœuvre. There are two kinds of manœuvres: positional, when the opponent's moves are not forced, and forced (see Réti's study, for an example). Then what is the difference between a combination and a forced manœuvre? A forced manœuvre is a forced variation without sacrifice.

The definition of a positional manœuvre is obvious: it is the transfer of a piece or a group of pieces to a different position. What practical conclusions can be drawn from these observations? Mainly terminological ones.

In commentaries the expression "fine combination" is frequently used when there has been no sacrifice whatever; or some combination is said to be one of many moves, when in reality it has lasted not more than two moves. For instance, in my game against Capablanca at Amsterdam in 1938, the combination ended in the course of two moves ( $30 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{R} 3$, and $31 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{R} 5 \mathrm{ch}$ ); all the rest was a forced manœuvre. ${ }^{1}$

Our problem composers regularly call those manœuvres which they carry out in their problems, "combinations." In my view this is incorrect.

Some masters like to call themselves players "of a combinative style."
Well, now there is an objective means of testing such statements.
${ }^{1}$ See diagram after Black's 29th move, Game No. 59, p. 156.

## RESULTS IN TOURNAMENTS AND MATCHES

| Year | Place | Tournament | Position Obtained and Points | Won | Lost | Drawn | No. of Games |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1923 | Leningrad | School Championship | App. 10th | $t$ of |  |  |  |
| 1924 | ," |  | 15 |  | 1 | - | 6 |
| 1924 | , | Non-category | 1 111 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| 1924 | , | 2B and 3rd Category | 1 81 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| 1924 | " | 2A Category | App. $50 \%$. | Tour | ment | nfinish |  |
| 1925 | ", | 2A and 1b Categories | 110 | 10 | 1 | - | 11 |
| 1925 | " | 1st Category | $3 \quad 7 \frac{1}{2}$ | 7 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| 1925 | ", |  | App. $80 \%$. | Tour | ment | finished |  |
| 1926 | , | Leningrad Championship, Semi-finals | 1 111 | 11 | - | 1 | 12 |
| 1926 | " | Leningrad Championship | 2-3 7 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 1926 | " | N.W. Provincial Semifinals | 2-3 9 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| 1926 | " | N.W. Provincial Championship | $3 \quad 6 \frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| 1927 | M | Tournament of "Six" | $27 \frac{1}{2}$ | 6 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| 1927 | M | U.S.S.R. Vth Championship | 5-6 121 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 20 |
| 1928 | Leningrad | Regional Metal-Workers' Committee Championship | $18 \frac{1}{2}$ | 7 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| 1929 | " | Regional Committee of Educational Workers' Championship | $1 \quad 11 \frac{1}{2}$ | 9 | - | 5 | 14 |
| 1929 | Odessa | U.S.S.R. Quarter-Finals, VIth Championship | 17 | 6 | - | 2 | 8 |
| 1929 | " | U.S.S.R. Semi-finals, VIth Championship | 3-4 21 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 1930 | Leningrad | Masters' Tournament | 1 61 | 6 | 1 |  | 8 |
| 1931 |  | Leningrad Championship | 144 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 17 |
| 1931 | Moscow | U.S.S.R. Semi-finals, VIIth Championship | $26 \frac{1}{2}$ | 6 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 1931 | " | VIIth U.S.S.R. Championship | 1 131 | 12 | 2 |  | 17 |
| 1932 | Leningrad | Leningrad Championship | $10^{10}$ | 9 | - | 2 | 11 |
| 1932 | " | Masters' Tournament in House of Scientists | $1 \quad 7$ | 6 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| 1933 |  | Masters' Tournament | 1-2 10 | 7 | - | 6 | 13 |
| 1933 | Leningrad | U.S.S.R. VIIIth Championship | 114 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 19 |
| 1933 | MoscowLeningrad | Match with Flohr | Drawn 6 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 12 |
| 1934 | Leningrad | Tournament with Euwe playing | $1 \quad 7 \frac{1}{2}$ | 5 | 1 | 5 | 11 |

RESULTS CONTINUED

| Year | Place | Tournament | Position Obtained and Points | Won | Lost | Drawn | No. of Games |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1934 | Hastings | International Tournament | 5-6 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 9 |
| 1935 | Moscow | 2nd International Tournament | 1-2 13 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 19 |
| 1936 | " | 3rd International Tournament | 212 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 18 |
| 1936 | Nottingham | International Tournament | 1-2 10 | 6 | - | 8 | 14 |
| 1937 | MoscowLeningrad | Match with Levenfish | Drawn 61 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 13 |
| 1938 | Leningrad | U.S.S.R. XIth Championship, Semi-finals | 114 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 17 |
| 1938 | Amsterdam | International Tournament | $3 \quad 7 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 2 | 9 | 14 |
| 1939 | Leningrad | U.S.S.R. XIth Championship |  | 8 | - | 9 | 17 |
| 1940 | Leningrad | Match with Ragozin | Won $8 \frac{1}{2}$ | 5 | - | 7 | 12 |
| 1940 | Moscow | U.S.S.R. XIIth Champion- ship | 5-6 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 8 | 4 | 7 | 19 |
| 1941 | LeningradMoscow | Match-Tournament for Absolute Champion | 131 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 20 |
| 1943 | Sverdlovsk | Masters' Tournament | 1 101 | 7 | - | 7 | 14 |
| 1943 | Moscow | Moscow Championship | 1 131 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| 1944 | " | U.S.S.R. XIIIth Championship | 1 121 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 16 |
| 1945 | " | U.S.S.R. XIVth Championship |  | 13 |  | 4 | 17 |
| 1946 | Groningen | International Tournament | 1 141 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
| 1947 | Moscow | Tournament in Memory of Tchigorin | 111 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 15 |
| 1948 | HagueMoscow | World Championship | 14 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 20 |

## INDEX TO OPPONENTS

## BY GAMES

Games in which opponents played White are in bold face.

| Alatortsev, 21, 28, 37 | Myasoyedov, 16, 26 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Alekhine, 53, 58 | Nenarokov, 5 |
| Batuyev, 17 | Panov, 71 |
| Belavenietz, 35, 36 | Pogrebyssky, 63 |
| Bogoljubov, 51 | Poliak, 7 |
| Boleslavsky, 69, 76, 79, 87, 91 | Rabinovich, 4, 27, 38, 61 |
| Bondarevsky, 75 | Ragozin, 3, 10, 65, 66, 67, 68 |
| Capablanca, 42, 59 | Rauzer, 23, 31 |
| Chekhover, 18, 29, 56 | Reshevsky, 57 |
| Denker, 93, 94 | Riumin, 24, 45 |
| Euwe, 98 | Rochlin, 11 |
| Flohr, 33, 34, 49, 85 | Romanovsky, 43, 90 |
| Goglidze, 46 | Silich, 9 |
| Gotthilf, 12 | Smyslov, 74, 77, 86, 95 |
| Grigoriev, 2 | Sokolsky, 55 |
| nyin-Zhenevsky, 6 | Sorokin, 20 |
| Kann, 13, 14, 15, 22, 40, 48, 50, 62, 81 | Sozin, 8 |
| Kasparian, 19 | Spielmann, 41 |
| Keres, 73 | Steiner, 96 |
| Kirillov, 25 | Stoltz, 1, 99 |
| Kotov, 64 | Tartakower, 52,100 |
| Levenfish, 44, 70 | Tolush, 60, 83, 89 |
| Lilienthal, 47, 72, 78, 92 | Veresov, 84 |
| Lisitsin, 30, 88 | Vidmar, 54, 97 |
| Liublinsky, 82 | Yudovich, 32, 39 |
| Makagonov, 80 |  |

## INDEX OF OPENINGS

(Games in which Botvinnik played White are in bold face.)
Alekhine's Defence, 49
Caro-Kann Defence, 33, 41
Catalan System, 97
Dutch Defence, 4, 14, 22, 34, 39, 96
English Opening, 25, 57, 66, 70
Four Knights Game, 11
French Defence, 3, 6, 27, 61, 63, 71, 74, 75, 76, 83, 86, 87, 89, 99, 100
Grünfeld Defence, 32. 42, 46, 55, 60, 67, 95
King's Indian Defence, 21, 52, 69, 72
Nimzo-Indian Defence, 12, 13, 15, 16, 26, 48, 56, 59, 62, 73, 84
Queen's Gambit Accepted, 28, 44, 58, 98
Queen's Gambit Declined, 1, 7, 8, 17, 19, 20, 23, 36, 37, 40, 54, 92, 93
Queen's Indian Defence, 2, 9, 18, 29, 35, 51
Ragozin's Defence, 64
Réti Opening, 30, 47, 85, 88
Ruy Lopez, 43, 45, 68, 77, 82, 91
Sicilian Defence, 31, 50, 53, 79, 81, 90
Slav Defence, 5, 24, 38, 65, 78, 80, 94
Two Knights Defence, 10


[^0]:    $8 \mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{P}$

[^1]:    B-B5

[^2]:    14 ...
    P-Kt5

[^3]:    37 ..
    $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathrm{KtP}$ ch!
    $38 \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$
    $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}$
    Resigns

[^4]:    $5 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
    B-Kt2

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ e.g. $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{B}($ or Kt$) \times \mathrm{Kt}$; $20 \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{Q}$; or $19 \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{K} 7 \mathrm{ch}, \mathrm{K}-\mathrm{R} 1$. But $18 \ldots$,

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Boleslavsky is an Ukrainian. S.G.

[^7]:    41 ...
    R-QB7 ch

[^8]:    11 ...
    P-K4

[^9]:    $4 \mathrm{KKt}-\mathrm{B} 3$
    Kt -B3
    $5 \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K} 5 \quad \mathrm{Kt}-\mathrm{Q} 2$

[^10]:    19 Q-B1
    B-Q2

[^11]:    7 QKt-Q2
    $\mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q}$

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Published in Shakhmatnaya Khronika (Chess Chronicle) of the Soviet Society for Cultural Relations, No. 3, March, 1945.

